arXiv:1209.4161v1 [math.CA] 19 Sep 2012

ON THE LOCAL $\mathbb{T}b$ THEOREM: A DIRECT PROOF UNDER DUALITY ASSUMPTION

MICHAEL T. LACEY AND ANTTI V. VÄHÄKANGAS

Abstract. We give a direct proof of the local $\mathbb{T}b$ Theorem, in the Euclidean setting, and under the assumption of dual exponents. This Theorem provides a flexible framework for proving the boundedness of a Calderón-Zygmund operator, supposing the existence of systems of local accretive functions. We assume that the integrability exponents on these systems of functions are of the form $1/p + 1/q \le 1$, and provide a direct proof. The principal point of interest is in the use of random grids and the corresponding construction of the corona. We also utilize certain twisted martingale transform inequalities.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. The Corona 5
3. Useful Inequalities 18
4. The Inner Product and the Main Term 25
5. The Remaining Terms 28
References 34

1. Introduction

Our subject is the local $\mathbb{T}b$ theorem, of which there are many variants. These theorems extend the David-Journé $\mathbb{T}1$ Theorem [8], and the $\mathbb{T}b$ Theorem of Christ [6] by giving very flexible sets of conditions under which an operator T with a Calderón-Zygmund kernel extends to a bounded

---

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 42B20 Secondary: 42B25, 42B35.

Key words and phrases. Local Tb theorem, T1 theorem, corona, twisted martingale transform, stopping cubes.

Research supported in part by grant NSF-DMS 0968499, and a grant from the Simons Foundation (#229596 to Michael Lacey).

A.V.V. was supported by the School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, and by the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, Vilho, Yrjö and Kalle Väisälä Foundation.

linear operator on L^2. The lectures of Steve Hofmann [12] indicate the range of interests in this type of questions. The goal of this paper is to give a new direct proof of this result, one that applies when the integrability conditions imposed in the hypotheses are those of duality. We do this in the setting of Lebesgue measure. A companion paper [19] addresses a perfect dyadic variant of this same result; it contains many of the same features of this argument, with (many) fewer technicalities.

We consider an operator T given in a bilinear form by

$$\langle Tf, g\rangle := \int_{\mathbf{R}^n}\int_{\mathbf{R}^n} K(x,y)f(y)g(x)\,dy\,dx$$

whenever f and g are two C^∞ compactly supported functions, whose supports are disjoint. The kernel $K(x,y)$ satisfies these estimates for some $\eta > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} |K(x,y)| &\le |x-y|^{-n}, \qquad & x \neq y, \\ |K(x,y) - K(x',y)| + |K(y,x) - K(y,x')| &\le \frac{|x-x'|^\eta}{|x-y|^{n+\eta}}, \qquad & |x-x'| < \tfrac{1}{2}|x-y|. \end{aligned}$$

Define $\mathbf{T}$ to be the norm of T as an operator on L^2 to itself. If this operator norm is finite, we say that T is a *Calderón-Zygmund operator.*

1.1. **Definition.** Fix $1 < p < \infty$. A collection of functions $\{b_Q : Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n \text{ is a cube}\}$ is called *a system of* p*-accretive functions with constant* $1 < \mathbf{A}$ if these conditions hold for each cube Q.

(1) b_Q is supported on Q and $\int_Q b_Q(x)\,dx = |Q|$.
(2) $\|b_Q\|_p \le \mathbf{A}|Q|^{1/p}$.

The following is our main result.

1.2. **Theorem.** *Suppose that* T *is a Calderón-Zygmund operator and, for* $1 < p_1, p_2 < \infty$, *with* $1/p_1 + 1/p_2 \le 1$, *there are systems* $\{b^j_Q\}$ *of* p_j*-accretive functions with constant* $\mathbf{A}$, *so that for a finite constant* $\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ *and all cubes* Q,

$$\int_Q |Tb^1_Q|^{p_2'} \le \mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}}^{p_2'}|Q|, \qquad \int_Q |T^* b^2_Q|^{p_1'} \le \mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}}^{p_1'}|Q|.$$

Then, we have a quantitative estimate $\mathbf{T} \lesssim_{n,\eta,p_1,p_2,\mathbf{A}} 1 + \mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ *for the operator norm of* T.

This, and more has been proved in the perfect dyadic case [1]. It was the hope that the proof technique of that paper could be lifted to the continuous case. In some measure that turned out to be true, but some of the direct methods of proof [10, 15] require assumptions that are stronger than the duality assumption. Theorem 1.2 in duality is known, and a corollary to Auscher-Yang [3], who provide a reduction to the perfect dyadic case.

More recently, Auscher-Routin [2, Theorem 3.5] have provided a direct proof in the setting of homogenous spaces, following an adaptation of the so-called Beylkin-Coifman-Rokhlin (BCR) algorithm, see [4, 9], as well as the martingale transform inequalities.

A comprehensive solution to Hofmann's problem has very recently been obtain by T. Hytönen and F. Nazarov, [16]. By applying perturbation techniques for both the operator and the accretive functions, they obtain a variant of Theorem 1.2 for all exponents $p_1, p_2 \in (1, \infty)$.

We provide an alternate direct proof of Theorem 1.2 in the case of duality, somewhat different in flavor. It is desirable to have such proofs from the viewpoint of extensions of the argument to other settings, such as the non-homogeneous setting [21], and those of elliptic PDEs [11].

Let us turn to a discussion of the proof technique. As is very common, absorbtion parameters enter into the proof at several stages, permitting us to resort to the assumed finite but non-quantitative norm bound on T, provided it is multiplied by a small absorption parameter. We use the well-known non-homogeneous techniques of [20], in particular the powerful technique of good and bad cubes. In the local Tb setting, there is however a delicate problem with the typical method of insertion of the good and bad cubes as is pointed out by Hytönen-Martikainen [15, Remark 4.1]. An important innovation of this paper is a corona construction to insert goodness in a natural way.

As is well known [1, 2, 11], by a local T1 theorem, we only need to consider the bilinear form $\langle T\widetilde{f}_1, \widetilde{f}_2\rangle$, where $|\widetilde{f}_1| = |\widetilde{f}_2| = \mathbf{1}_{Q^0}$, for a fixed cube Q^0. One works with two dyadic grids, $\mathcal{D}^1$ and $\mathcal{D}^2$, which are random and defined on independent probability spaces Ω^j, $j = 1, 2$. A cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}^1$ has a property of being *bad*, in that it is close to the boundary of some significantly larger cube in the other grid $\mathcal{D}^2$. This property is an event in Ω^2, that has probability that can be made arbitrarily small, giving rise to an absorption parameter. Otherwise the cube is *good*. One projects $\widetilde{f}_1$ onto the good cubes, calling the resulting projection f_1. This makes an error that is small in all L^p spaces on average, although the projection is now a function of Ω^1 and Ω^2. This is the first of several absorbtion arguments. One then makes a standard selection of stopping cubes $\mathcal{S}^j \subset \mathcal{D}^j$, and local b functions b^j_S for $S \in \mathcal{S}^j$. The stopping cubes $\mathcal{S}^j$ are sparse, in the sense that the collection is a Carleson sequence of cubes.

A point of departure is that one constructs functions β^1_S which are the selected b^1_S projected *away from* those bad cubes which themselves have S as parent in $\mathcal{S}^1$. The reason for doing so is, that the twisted martingale difference of f_1, with respect to β^1_S and over a bad cube Q with $\mathcal{S}^1$

parent S, will (typically) be zero—a very desirable feature. Critically, the resulting function β^1_S is also a function of Ω^1 and Ω^2, and in addition, the original collection of stopping cubes $\mathcal{S}^1$ is not so well adapted to the β^1_S. On the other hand, favorably to us, these functions can be viewed as small perturbations of b^1_S, in the sense of probability.

In order to adopt the usage of perturbed functions in twisted martingale differences, one cannot run the stopping cube selection process again, due to the unacceptable dependices on Ω^1 and Ω^2. Instead, one invokes absorbtion, arguing that one can *truncate* the stopping tree $\mathcal{S}^1$ inside a set B^1 that is small on average. This completes the corona construction. The details of this argument take up §2, which is almost half the length of this paper.

Turning to the remaining part of the argument, one is in a familar situation [20] where only *good* cubes $P \in \mathcal{D}^1$ and $Q \in \mathcal{D}^2$ need to be considered. There are additional tools that are quite useful, namely certain martingale transform results for twisted martingale differences, and associated half-twisted inequalities that are *universal*, in that they hold in all L^q-spaces. These inequalities also play a crucial role in [2, Lemma 5.3]; also see the companion paper [19] that serves as a model for this one. The double sum over P, Q is reduced, by symmetry, to the case of $\ell P \geq \ell Q$, and this sum is further decomposed into subcases according to the position and size of Q relative to P. The case of Q deeply inside P admits a very direct control, by appeal to the twisted martingale transform inequalities. This is the essential paraproduct term. (Experts should note that we do not appeal to Carleson measure arugments at any stage of the argument; in this we follow [2, 17, 18].) A potentially troublesome case is when $Q \subset 3P \setminus P$. If Q is substantially smaller than P, then it is still relatively far from the boundary of P, due to goodness. We address this case by exploiting the smoothness condition on the kernel K, and the universal half-twisted inequalities. The case of P and Q having the same approximate size and position requires new perturbation inequalities for the twisted martingale transforms, also a new argument. This 'diagonal' case is the hardest one in many existing arguments, including ours. The remaining cases depend upon standard off-diagonal estimates for singular integrals, and universal martingale transform inequalities.

Notation For a cube Q, $\langle f \rangle_Q := |Q|^{-1} \int_Q f \, dx$, and $\ell Q = |Q|^{1/n}$ is the side length of the cube. $A \lesssim B$ means that $A \leq C \cdot B$, where C is an unspecified constant independent of A and B. The distances in $\mathbf{R}^n$ are measured in terms of the supremum norm, $|x| = \|x\|_\infty$ for $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$.

2. The Corona

It is a consequence of the local T1 theorem, see e.g. [1, 2, 11], that

$$\mathbf{T} \lesssim 1 + \sup_{Q\subset \mathbf{R}^n \text{ cube}} |Q|^{-1} \|\mathbf{1}_Q T^* \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{L^1} + \sup_{Q\subset \mathbf{R}^n \text{ cube}} |Q|^{-1} \|\mathbf{1}_Q T \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{L^1} \,.$$

Without loss of generality, we can assume that the last term dominates. Fix a cube Q^0 for which

$$\mathbf{T}|Q^0| \lesssim \|\mathbf{1}_{Q^0} T \mathbf{1}_{Q^0}\|_{L^1} \,. \tag{2.1}$$

Then, for notational convenience, take two functions $\widetilde{f}_1, \widetilde{f}_2$ with $|\widetilde{f}_1| = |\widetilde{f}_2| = \mathbf{1}_{Q^0}$, so that

$$\|\mathbf{1}_{Q^0} T \mathbf{1}_{Q^0}\|_{L^1} = \langle T\, \widetilde{f}_1, \widetilde{f}_2\rangle \,.$$

The point of the section is to devise a corona (decomposition) which proves this.

2.2. **Lemma.** *For every* $0 < \upsilon_0 < 1$*, there are functions* f_1 *and* f_2*, and a constant* $0 < C < \infty$ *independent of both* $\mathbf{T}$ *and* $\mathbf{T}_{\text{loc}}$*, such that these conditions hold.*

$$\|\widetilde{f}_j - f_j\|_2 < \upsilon_0 |Q^0|^{1/2} \,, \qquad j = 1, 2 \,,$$

$$\bigl|\langle T f_1, f_2\rangle\bigr| < \{C(1 + \mathbf{T}_{\text{loc}}) + \upsilon_0 \mathbf{T}\}|Q^0| \,. \tag{2.3}$$

This lemma and an absorption argument complete the proof of Theorem 1.2. The construction of the corona, which has properties that will allow the straight forward proof of (2.3), is itself hardly straight forward. It will be highly dependent upon certain random constructions, and there will be several absorption parameters that lead to the constant υ_0 above. A particular obstruction, one that motivates our complicated corona construction, is the identification of the correct way to insert the goodness of cubes.

2.1. **Random Grids.**

We use the foundational tool of random grids, as initiated by Nazarov-Treil-Volberg [21], which has in turn been used repeatedly. See [13, 14, 18, 23], to give just four citations touching on different topics. The properties we need are well-known, and when we appeal to them, are clearly identified. Throughout, we will have a random dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^1$ for the functions $\widetilde{f}_1, f_1$ and a random dyadic grid $\mathcal{D}^2$ for functions $\widetilde{f}_2, f_2$.

The random grids are constructed this way. Let $\mathcal{D}^0$ be the standard dyadic grid in $\mathbf{R}^n$. For a fixed cube $\widehat{Q} \in \mathcal{D}^0$, the *position* of a translated cube is

$$Q = \widehat{Q} \dot{+} \omega^1 := \widehat{Q} + \sum_{j\,:\,2^{-j} < \ell Q} 2^{-j} \omega^1_j \,,$$

which is a function of $\omega^1 \in \Omega^1 := \left(\{0,1\}^n\right)^{\mathbf{Z}}$. Denote by $\mathcal{D}^1$ the collection of these translated cubes. The natural uniform probability measure $\mathbb{P}^1$ is placed upon Ω^1. That is, each component ω^1_j, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, has an equal probability 2^{-n} of taking any of the 2^n values, and all components are independent of each other. The expectation with respect to $\mathbb{P}^1$ is denoted by $\mathbb{E}^1$. Define Ω^2 in the same manner, with an independent copy of Ω^1. It will be important to distinguish between these two copies, so we write $\omega^j \in \Omega^j$ for the elements of the probability space that define $\mathcal{D}^j$. The product $\mathbb{P}^1 \otimes \mathbb{P}^2$ is denoted by $\mathbb{P}$, and the corresponding expectation $\mathbb{E}_1\mathbb{E}_2$ is denoted by $\mathbb{E}$.

As our construction has several parts, we will often simply write Q for a cube in $\mathcal{D}^j$, instead of the heavier notation $\widehat{Q}\dot{+}\omega^j$ with $\widehat{Q} \in \mathcal{D}^0$. Those parts of the argument that depend upon the construction of the random grids will be clearly identified.

We also need some notation. Given $Q \in \mathcal{D}^j$, we denote by $\mathrm{ch}(Q)$ the 2^n dyadic children of Q. Given $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{D}^j$, we can also refer to $\mathrm{ch}_{\mathcal{S}}(S)$ the $\mathcal{S}$-children of $S \in \mathcal{S}$: The maximal elements S' of $\mathcal{S}$ that are strictly contained in S. For a cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}^j$, that is contained in a cube in $\mathcal{S}$, we take $\pi_{\mathcal{S}}Q$ to be the $\mathcal{S}$-parent of Q: The minimal element of $\mathcal{S}$ that contains Q. Set, once and for all, the familiar and convienent choice [13, 15, 21]

$$\epsilon = \frac{\eta}{2(\eta+n)}\,.$$

Throughout $r \geq 3/\epsilon$ should be thought of as a large integer, which satisfies probability condition (4) below, and whose exact value is assigned later.

We say that a cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}^1$ is *bad*, if there is $P \in \mathcal{D}^2$ such that $\ell(P) \geq 2^r \ell(Q)$ and

$$\operatorname{dist}(Q, \partial P) \leq (\ell Q)^{\epsilon}(\ell P)^{1-\epsilon}\,.$$

Otherwise, Q is *good*. The definitions for $Q \in \mathcal{D}^2$ are similar. These properties are well-known for a cube $Q \in \mathcal{D}^1$.

1. The goodness/badness of Q is a random variable on Ω^2;
2. The position and goodness/badness of Q are independent random variables—indeed, the former is a function of $\omega^1 \in \Omega^1$;
3. The probability $\pi_{\mathrm{good}} := \mathbb{P}^2(Q \text{ is good})$ is independent of Q;
4. $\pi_{\mathrm{bad}} := 1 - \pi_{\mathrm{good}} \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon r}$, provided ϵr is sufficiently large.

Define the good and bad projections by $I = P^j_{\mathrm{good}} + P^j_{\mathrm{bad}}$, where

$$P^j_{\mathrm{good}}\phi := \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{D}^j \,:\, Q \text{ is good}} D_Q\phi\,, \qquad j = 1, 2.$$

Here $D_Q\phi = \sum_{Q'\in\mathrm{ch}(Q)}\{\langle\phi\rangle_{Q'} - \langle\phi\rangle_Q\}\mathbf{1}_{Q'}$ is the usual martingale difference associated with Q. We have the following proposition on the norms of the bad projections.

2.4. **Proposition.** *For* $1 < q < \infty$ *and* $\{j,k\} = \{1,2\}$, *there is a constant* $c_q > 0$ *so that*

$$\mathbb{E}^k\|P^j_{\mathsf{bad}}\phi\|_q^q \lesssim 2^{-c_q\epsilon r}\|\phi\|_q^q\,.$$

Here ω^j *is fixed, and* $\phi \in L^q$ *is any function that is independent of sequences* $\omega^k \in \Omega^k$*.*

We appeal to this a few times below, and the constant $0 < c_q < 1$ that appears in the exponent on the right will be a function of p_1 and p_2. We will supress this dependence in notation, writing only $2^{-c\epsilon r}$.

Proof. The basic idea is to apply Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem to the linear operator $P^j_{\mathsf{bad}} : L^q(dx) \to L^q(\mathbb{P}^k \otimes dx)$. The projection to bad cubes is a martingale transform [5], hence the following inequality with no decay holds,

$$\mathbb{E}^k\|P^j_{\mathsf{bad}}\phi\|_p^p \le \sup\{\|P^j_{\mathsf{bad}}\phi\|_p^p : \omega^k \in \Omega^k\} \lesssim \|\phi\|_p^p\,, \quad 1 < p < \infty\,.$$

Thus, it suffices to verify the claimed decay for $q = 2$. To this end, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^k\|P^j_{\mathsf{bad}}\phi\|_2^2 &= \mathbb{E}^k \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{D}^j\\ Q \text{ is bad}}} \|D_Q\phi\|_2^2 \\ &= \pi_{\mathsf{bad}} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{D}^j} \|D_Q\phi\|_2^2 = \pi_{\mathsf{bad}}\|\phi\|_2^2\,.\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the position of $Q \in \mathcal{D}^j$ is determined by $\omega^j \in \Omega^j$ which is fixed, and badness of Q is a random variable on Ω^k, $\{j,k\} = \{1,2\}$. □

2.2. **Selection of** f_j**.** We will prove Lemma 2.2 by averaging over random grids. For $j \in \{1,2\}$, let $\mathcal{A}^j_*$ denote all (at most) 2^n cubes $Q \in \mathcal{D}^j$ such that $Q \cap Q^0 \neq \emptyset$ and $\ell Q^0 \le \ell Q < 2\ell Q^0$. Let $\mathcal{A}^j$ be all cubes in $\mathcal{D}^j$ contained in some $Q \in \mathcal{A}^j_*$. Recall that functions $\widetilde{f}_j$ are chosen in connection with (2.1), and they are equal to $\mathbf{1}_{Q^0}$ in absolute value. We define the approximates of these two functions to be

$$f_j := \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{A}^j_*} \langle\widetilde{f}_j\rangle_Q \mathbf{1}_Q + \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{A}^j\\ Q \text{ is good}}} D_Q\widetilde{f}_j\,.$$

In view of Proposition 2.4, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|\widetilde{f}_j - f_j\|_2^2 \lesssim 2^{-c\epsilon r}|Q^0|\,. \tag{2.5}$$

Hence, it suffices to estimate $\mathbb{E}|\langle Tf_1, f_2\rangle|$.

The functions f_j lie in BMO:—a dyadic variant associated with the grid $\mathcal{D}^j$. It follows from the corresponding John-Nirenberg inequality that

$$\|f_j\|_q \lesssim |Q^0|^{1/q}, \qquad 1 < q < \infty, \tag{2.6}$$

with the implied constant independent of sequences ω^1 and ω^2. The fact that the functions f_j can nevertheless be unbounded creates a minor set of difficulties for us.

2.3. **The Stopping Cubes Construction.**

In order to accomodate the good-bad decomposition, we will need a significant modification of the usual selection process of stopping trees and local b functions. Some definitions will help explain the end result that we are after. For the following definition, it is convenient to denote $T^1 = T$ and $T^2 = T^*$.

2.7. **Definition.** Constants $0 < \tau, \delta < 1$ are fixed, and $\{j, k\} = \{1, 2\}$. A collection of integrable functions $\{\beta^j_S \ : \ S \in \mathcal{S}^j \subset \mathcal{D}^j\}$ is *stopping data (perturbed stopping data)* for a collection $\mathcal{G}^j \subset \mathcal{D}^j$ of cubes if the following conditions hold with $\mathbf{A}_j = 1/2$, $\mathbf{B}_j = \delta^{-1}\mathbf{A}^{p_j}$, and $\mathbf{C}_j = \delta^{-1}\mathbf{T}^{p'_k}_{\text{loc}}$. (in case of perturbed stopping data: $\mathbf{A}_j = 1/4$, $\mathbf{B}_j \lesssim \delta^{-1}\mathbf{A}^{p_j}$, and $\mathbf{C}_j \lesssim \delta^{-1}\mathbf{T}^{p'_k}_{\text{loc}} + \upsilon_1^{p'_k}\mathbf{T}^{p'_k}$ for some constant $0 < \upsilon_1 < 1$.)

1. Every $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$ is contained in some $S \in \mathcal{S}^j$. The same holds for every child $Q' \in \text{ch}(Q)$, but the parent $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q'$ need not equal $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q$, even if Q is a minimal cube in $\mathcal{G}^j$.
2. If $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$ with $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q = S$ (or $Q \in \text{ch}(R)$ with $R \in \mathcal{G}^j$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q = S$), then
   - (a) $\langle \beta^j_S\rangle_Q \geq \mathbf{A}_j$. (Don't divide by zero.)
   - (b) $\langle |M\beta^j_S|^{p_j}\rangle_Q \leq \mathbf{B}_j$. (Local norm of β^j_S controlled.)
   - (c) $\langle |T^j\beta^j_S|^{p'_k}\rangle_Q \leq \mathbf{C}_j$. (Local norm of $T^j\beta^j_S$ is controlled.)
3. $\sum_{S'\in\text{ch}_{\mathcal{S}^j}(S)}|S'| \leq \tau|S|$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}^j$. ($\mathcal{S}^j$ is a sparse collection of cubes.)

For $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$, we define the *twisted martingale difference* by

$$\Delta^{\beta^j}_Q \phi := \sum_{Q'\in\text{ch}(Q)} \left\{ \frac{\langle \phi\rangle_{Q'}}{\langle \beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q'}\rangle_{Q'}}\beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q'} - \frac{\langle \phi\rangle_{Q}}{\langle \beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q}\rangle_{Q}}\beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q}\right\}\mathbf{1}_{Q'}, \qquad \phi \in L^1_{\text{loc}}. \tag{2.8}$$

This is well defined, as Q has an $\mathcal{S}^j$ parent, and there is no division by zero, conditions (1) and (2a). We also define the *half-twisted martingale difference* by

$$\widetilde{D}^{\beta^j}_Q \phi := \left\{ \sum_{\substack{Q'\in\text{ch}(Q)\\ \pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q=\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q'}} \frac{\langle \phi\rangle_{Q'}}{\langle \beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q'}\rangle_{Q'}}\mathbf{1}_{Q'}\right\} - \frac{\langle \phi\rangle_{Q}}{\langle \beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q}\rangle_{Q}}\mathbf{1}_{Q}. \tag{2.9}$$

Observe that here we do not multiply by a β^j function, and the sum over the children excludes those with a different $\mathcal{S}^j$ parent (this difference would force a change in the β^j function).

The following Lemma is a key tool for eliminating the martingale differences that are associated with bad cubes.

2.10. **Lemma.** *Suppose $\Lambda > 1$ and $0 < \upsilon_1 < 4^{-1-n}$. Then, there are collections $\mathcal{G}^j \subset \mathcal{D}^j$ of cubes, $j = 1, 2$, and perturbed stopping data $\{\beta^j_S \ : \ S \in \mathcal{S}^j\}$ for $\mathcal{G}^j$ such that conditions (1)–(4) below are satisfied.*

1. *Every cube $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$ is good.*
2. *For all $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$, $\langle |f_j| \rangle_Q \le \Lambda$.*
3. *For all $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$ with child Q', and $S \in \mathcal{S}^j$ with $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} Q \subset S$, define a constant $\lambda_{Q'}$ by*

$$\lambda_{Q'} \mathbf{1}_{Q'} := \mathbf{1}_{Q'} \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{G}^j \,:\, P \supset Q \\ \pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} P = S}} \widetilde{D}^{\beta^j}_P f_j \,. \tag{2.11}$$

   Then, $|\lambda_{Q'}| \lesssim \Lambda$.
4. *Assuming $\Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda \upsilon_1^{-1} \cdot 2^{-c\epsilon r} < 1$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \Big| \langle T f_1, f_2 \rangle - \sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}^1} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}^2} \langle T \Delta^{\beta^1}_P f_1, \Delta^{\beta^2}_Q f_2 \rangle \Big| \\ &\quad \le C_1 \big\{ 1 + \mathbf{T}_{\textup{loc}} + (\upsilon_1 + \Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda \upsilon_1^{-1} \cdot 2^{-c\epsilon r}) \mathbf{T} \big\} |Q^0| . \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

   Here $C_1 = C_1(p_1, p_2, n, \mathbf{A})$ does not depend upon υ_1, Λ, r.

It is clear that $0 < \upsilon_1 \ll 1$, and $\Lambda \gg 1$, and $r \gg 1$ are absorbtion parameters.

The implication of (4) above is that, in order to complete the proof of Lemma 2.2, it suffices to verify the following inequality,

$$\Big| \sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}^1} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}^2} \langle T \Delta^{\beta^1}_P f_1, \Delta^{\beta^2}_Q f_2 \rangle \Big| \le \big\{ C_2 \{ 1 + \mathbf{T}_{\textup{loc}} \} + C_3 r \upsilon_1 \Lambda^2 \mathbf{T} \big\} |Q^0| \,. \tag{2.13}$$

We emphasize that inequality (2.13) is uniform in ω^1 and ω^2, and that it is distinct from (2.12). The constant $C_3 = C_3(p_1, p_2, n, \eta, \mathbf{A})$, that is independent of absorption parameters, and the product $r \upsilon_1 \Lambda^2$ of absorption parameters appear on the right. The constant

$$C_2 = C_2(p_1, p_2, n, \eta, \mathbf{A}, r, \Lambda, \upsilon_1)$$

is allowed to depend also upon the absorption parameters.

Returning to the proof of Lemma 2.2, let us consider inequalities (2.5), (2.12), and (2.13). By taking $\Lambda > 1$ sufficiently large, and then choosing r large enough and assigning $\upsilon_1 = r^{-2}$, we complete the proof of the aforementioned Lemma.

The proof of (2.13), taken up in the next section, has several advantages for us.

1. We need only consider good cubes, which is the primary goal of the construction.
2. By normalizing both f_1 and f_2 with a factor Λ^{-1}, the sums of the half-twisted differences are controlled by $c \lesssim 1$ across the collections of cubes, which is related to the well-known telescoping property needed in the control of paraproduct terms. This normalization is assumed in the beginning of §3, and thereafter.
3. The argument to control the sum in (2.13) is now largely standard in nature, following the lines of [20, 24], and including some inovations from [17, 18], to avoid construction of auxilary Carleson measure estimates. However, certain perturbation inequalities are needed when treating cubes that are nearby, both in size and position.

2.14. *Remark.* Hytönen and Martikainen [15, Remark 4.1] have pointed to serious concerns with some existing approaches to the insertion of goodness in local Tb theorems. The substance of the problem arises from the fact that the twisted martingale differences depend upon the choice of grid, and the collection of local b functions, making averaging arguments—such as the one used in the proof of Proposition 2.4—not transparently true. Our goal is to insert goodness in a transparent manner, and this is one of the main contributions of the present paper.

2.15. *Remark.* The dependence of the quantitative estimates on the parameters aside from $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{\mathsf{loc}}$ is not straight forward, and generally speaking we do not track it. However, we need to track the dependence of a constant c on absorption parameters r, Λ, υ_1, if it appears in an expression $c \cdot \mathbf{T}$. Accordingly, the symbol '$\lesssim$' should be read as 'the unspecified implied constant that depends upon parameters there is no need to track'.

The remainder of this section is taken up with the proof of Lemma 2.10. We begin with a construction of auxiliary *stopping data* $\{b_S^j \;:\; S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j\}$ for the collection $\mathcal{A}^j$, which we defined when we selected f_j. The claimed *perturbed stopping data* will be later constructed by using this auxiliary stopping data as a starting point.

Initialize $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ to be $\mathcal{A}^j_*$. For each cube S in this collection, consider the function b_S^j given to us by the local Tb hypothesis, see the formulation of Theorem 1.2. Add to $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ the maximal dyadic descendants $Q \subset S$ which either fail any one of the criteria (a)—(c) in Definition 2.7, with

$\beta^j_S := b^j_S$, or fail the condition

$$\inf_{x\in Q} M|b^j_S|^{p_j}(x) \le \delta^{-1}\mathbf{A}^{p_j}\,. \tag{2.16}$$

Concerning these stopping conditions, let E_S be the union of maximal descendents Q of S such that $\langle b^j_S\rangle_Q < \frac{1}{2}$. We have, using the higher integrability of b^j_S,

$$\begin{aligned}|S| = \int_S b^j_S\,dx &= \int_{E_S} b^j_S\,dx + \int_{S\setminus E_S} b^j_S\,dx \\ &\le \tfrac{1}{2}|S| + \mathbf{A}|S\setminus E_S|^{1/p'_j}|S|^{1/p_j}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, $(2\mathbf{A})^{-p'_j}|S| \le |S\setminus E_S|$. Next, let us consider the union F_S of maximal descendants Q of S, failing (2.16) or any one of the mentioned criteria (b)—(c). By inspection, $|F_S| \lesssim \delta|S|$. Therefore, with choice of $\delta = \delta(p_j, n, \mathbf{A})$, we can continue the construction of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ inductively to meet conditions (1)—(2) and also the sparsness condition (3) in Definition 2.7 with $\tau = \tau(p_j, n, \mathbf{A})$. This construction of $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ and $\{b^j_S \;:\; S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j\}$ is fairly standard, and we emphasize that it only depends upon ω^j. Below, we will refer to $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$, and its subsets, as collections of *stopping cubes*.

One has the familiar representation below, of which a variant will appear later. See for instance [7, Lemma 3.1], [20, Lemma 4.1], or the proof of [15, Lemma 3.5].

2.17. **Lemma.** *The following equality holds almost everywhere, and in* L^{p_j}, $j = 1, 2$.

$$f_j(x) = \sum_{S\in\mathcal{A}^j_*} \langle f_j\rangle_S b^j_S(x) + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{A}^j} \Delta^{b^j}_Q f_j(x)\,.$$

The last series is interpreted as $\lim_{k_j\to\infty} \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{A}^j:\ell Q\ge 2^{-k_j}} \Delta^{b^j}_Q f_j$.

However, we would end up with certain difficulties if we applied this representation formula. In order to explain, let us first observe that $p'_2 \le p_1$ because $1/p_1 + 1/p_2 \le 1$. Hence, any series converging in L^{p_1} converges locally in $L^{p'_2}$. Since $\bigcup\mathcal{A}^2_*$ is compact, this allows us to write

$$\begin{aligned}\langle Tf_1, f_2\rangle = &\sum_{R\in\mathcal{A}^1_*} \langle f_1\rangle_R \langle Tb^1_R, f_2\rangle + \sum_{S\in\mathcal{A}^2_*} \langle f_2\rangle_S \langle f_1, T^*b^2_S\rangle \\ &- \sum_{R\in\mathcal{A}^1_*}\sum_{S\in\mathcal{A}^2_*} \langle f_1\rangle_R\langle f_2\rangle_S\langle Tb^1_R, b^2_S\rangle + \sum_{P\in\mathcal{A}^1}\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{A}^2} \langle T\Delta^{b^1}_P f_1, \Delta^{b^2}_Q f_2\rangle\,.\end{aligned}$$

The last series is interpreted as the limit below,

$$\lim_{k_1\to\infty}\lim_{k_2\to\infty} \sum_{\substack{P\in\mathcal{A}^1\\ \ell P\ge 2^{-k_1}}} \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{A}^2\\ \ell Q\ge 2^{-k_2}}} \langle T\Delta^{b^1}_P f_1, \Delta^{b^2}_Q f_2\rangle\,.$$

The focus is on this double sum. Its direct analysis contains difficulties due to the presence of martingale differences that are associated with bad cubes. This forces us to modify Lemma 2.17 slightly, and the modification allows us to restrict the core summation to martingale differences that are associated only with good cubes.

Once the corona construction is complete, we will assume that we have a finite sum, such as the ones above. Various rearrangments of the finite sums are made, and bounds will be independent of the finite truncations of the sums.

2.4. **Perturbation of the b functions.** In a departure from standard arguments, we modify the b^j_S functions already selected, $S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$. This is an important step in the reduction to a summation involving only good cubes. For $S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$, we define

$$\beta^j_S := b^j_S - \widetilde{\beta}^j_S\,, \quad \text{where} \quad \widetilde{\beta}^j_S := \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{A}^j\,:\,\pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j}Q=S\\ Q\text{ is bad}}} D_Q b^j_S \tag{2.18}$$

Note how the sum defining $\widetilde{\beta}^j_S$ is formed. It is only over classical martingale differences associated with bad cubes in $\mathcal{A}^j$ which have the same stopping parent. Particular care must be taken with these perturbations β^j_S, as they are now functions of both ω^1 and ω^2. Here, we show that $\widetilde{\beta}^j_S$ is a small function, on average.

2.19. **Lemma.** *For $\{j,k\}=\{1,2\}$ and all $S\in\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$, there holds*

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\widetilde{\beta}^j_S\|_{\mathrm{BMO}} \lesssim 1\,,\\ &\mathbb{E}^k\|\widetilde{\beta}^j_S\|^q_q \lesssim 2^{-c\epsilon r}|S|\,, \qquad 1<q<\infty\,.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $Q\in\mathcal{D}^j$ be such that $\pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j}Q=S$. Writing $\epsilon_{Q'} := \mathbf{1}_{Q'\subset Q}\mathbf{1}_{\pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j}Q'=S}\mathbf{1}_{Q'\text{ is bad}}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\int_Q |\widetilde{\beta}^j_S - \langle\widetilde{\beta}^j_S\rangle_Q|^{p_j}\,dx\right)^{1/p_j} &= \Big\|\sum_{Q'\subset Q} D_{Q'}\widetilde{\beta}^j_S\Big\|_{p_j}\\ &= \Big\|\sum_{Q'\in\mathcal{D}^j}\epsilon_{Q'}D_{Q'}(\mathbf{1}_Q b^j_S)\Big\|_{p_j}\\ &\lesssim \|\mathbf{1}_Q b^j_S\|_{p_j} \le \langle |Mb^j_S|^{p_1}\rangle_Q^{1/p_j}|Q|^{1/p_j} \lesssim |Q|^{1/p_j}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have appealed to the boundedness of martingale transforms, and the stopping rules. The remaining cases either reduce to this, or are trivial. Hence the BMO assertion is true.

Concerning the L^q estimate, we apply Proposition 2.4 and the John-Nirenberg inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^k \|\widetilde{\beta}^j_S\|_q^q &= \mathbb{E}^k \Bigl\| P^j_{\mathrm{bad}} \Bigl[\sum_{Q \,:\, \pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q = S} D_Q b^j_S \Bigr] \Bigr\|_q^q \\ &\lesssim 2^{-c\epsilon r} \Bigl\| \sum_{Q \,:\, \pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q = S} D_Q b^j_S \Bigr\|_q^q \lesssim 2^{-c\epsilon r} |S| \cdot \Bigl\| \sum_{Q \,:\, \pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q = S} D_Q b^j_S \Bigr\|_{\mathrm{BMO}}^q .\end{aligned}$$

By arguing as above, we finish the proof. □

2.5. **Truncation of the Stopping Tree.** We will use the functions β^j_S as the basis of perturbed stopping data, but the path to this is not yet clear for these reasons: (A) functions β^1_S are not suitable to form the twisted martingale differences; (B) we want an additional property related to goodness of these differences; and (C) the functions f_j are unbounded.

Concerning point (B), one should not fail to note that $\Delta^{\beta^j}_Q \mathbf{1}$ need not be zero; nevertheless, there is a simple sufficient condition for a twisted martingale difference to be identically zero.

2.20. **Proposition.** *Assume that* $Q \in \mathcal{A}^j$ *is bad, and no child of* Q *is in* $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$. *Suppose* $\langle \beta^j_S \rangle_Q \neq 0$, *where* $S = \pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q$. *Then, both* $\Delta^{\beta^j}_Q f_j$ *and* $\widetilde{D}^{\beta^j}_Q f_j$ *are well defined using* $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ *in parent selectors for* β^j *functions, and* $\Delta^{\beta^j}_Q f_j \equiv 0 \equiv \widetilde{D}^{\beta^j}_Q f_j$.

Proof. By assumptions and definitions, the averages of f_j and β^j_S do not change moving from cube Q to a child of Q. By inspection of (2.8) and (2.9), the ratios in the definition of either martingale difference of f_j are all well defined and equal, hence cancel. □

The previous considerations lead to the following three types of undesirable cubes $Q \in \mathcal{A}^j$, where $\Lambda > 1$ and $0 < \upsilon_1 < 4^{-1-n}$ are absorption parameters and $\{j, k\} = \{1, 2\}$.

- **Type A:** $\{\langle |M \widetilde{\beta}^j_{\pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q}|^{p_j} \rangle_Q \geq \upsilon_1^{p_j}$ or $\langle |T^j \widetilde{\beta}^j_{\pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q}|^{p'_k} \rangle_Q \geq \upsilon_1^{p'_k} \mathbf{T}^{p'_k}\}$ or Q has a child $S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ such that $\{\langle |M \widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p_j} \rangle_S \geq \upsilon_1^{p_j}$ or $\langle |T^j \widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p'_k} \rangle_S \geq \upsilon_1^{p'_k} \mathbf{T}^{p'_k}\}$.
- **Type B:** Q is not of Type A and Q has a child in $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$, and Q is bad.
- **Type C:** Q is not of Type A, nor Type B, and $\langle |f_j| \rangle_Q > \Lambda$.

Each of these three types depend upon both ω^1 and ω^2. Let $\mathcal{B}^{j,\alpha}$ be the collection of maximal cubes in $\mathcal{A}^j$ of Type α, $\alpha = A, B, C$, and let $\mathcal{B}^j$ be the maximal cubes in the union of these three collections. Define $B^{j,\alpha} := \bigcup \{Q \,:\, Q \in \mathcal{B}^{j,\alpha}\}$, and $B^j := B^{j,A} \cup B^{j,B} \cup B^{j,C}$.

It is tempting to restart the selection of the b functions for those cubes $Q \in \mathcal{B}^j$, but this would introduce opaque interdependicies among the selected functions, since $\mathcal{B}^j$ is a function of both ω^1 and ω^2. Instead, what we do below is truncate the stopping tree $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ at the collection $\mathcal{B}^j$. This will be an admissible step, as the sets B^j are small in measure, on average, so that the resulting error terms can be absorbed.

We can now define the collections $\mathcal{G}^j$, and the perturbed stopping data claimed by Lemma 2.10. Take $\mathcal{G}^j$ to be all *good* cubes in $\mathcal{A}^j$, *not contained* in any cube in $\mathcal{B}^j$. Set $\mathcal{S}^j$ to be $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ less any cube *strictly* contained in some $Q \in \mathcal{B}^j$. For convenience, we also denote by $\mathcal{R}^j \supset \mathcal{G}^j$ all cubes in $\mathcal{A}^j$, *both good and bad*, not contained in any cube in $\mathcal{B}^j$. We emphasize the fact that $Q \in \mathcal{R}^j$ is not of any Type α, $\alpha = A, B, C$.

Take the data for $\mathcal{G}^j$ to be $\{\beta^j_S \;:\; S \in \mathcal{S}^j\}$. Next we will show that this is actually perturbed stopping data, as claimed. By construction,

$$\pi_{\mathcal{S}_j} Q = \pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q, \quad \pi_{\mathcal{S}_j} Q' = \pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q' \tag{2.21}$$

if $Q \in \mathcal{R}^j$ and $Q' \in \mathrm{ch}(Q)$. Accordingly $\{\beta^j_S \;:\; S \in \mathcal{S}^j\}$ meets property (1) in Definition 2.7 of perturbed stopping data. Another useful consequence of (2.21) is that we can compute the martingale differences $\Delta_P^{\beta^j}$ and $\widetilde{D}_P^{\beta^j}$ in case of $P \in \mathcal{R}^j$ by using freely either $\mathcal{S}^j$ or $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ in the parent selectors for β^j functions.

The sparseness property (3) is trivial for $\mathcal{S}^j$ since $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ satisfies it and $\mathcal{S}^j \subset \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$. The remaining properties (2a)—(2c) of perturbed stopping data follow from this Lemma. It also shows that the set $B^{j,A}$ has small measure—on average.

2.22. **Lemma.** *Fix a cube $S \in \mathcal{S}^j$. Then, there holds (1)—(3) below.*

1. $\langle \beta^j_S \rangle_S = 1$.
2. $\langle |\beta^j_S|^{p_j} \rangle_S \lesssim \mathbf{A}^{p_j}$.
3. *Let $Q \in \mathcal{R}^j$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} Q = S$ (or Q is a child of a cube in $\mathcal{R}^j$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} Q = S$). Then,*
    - (a) $\langle \beta^j_S \rangle_Q \geq \frac{1}{4}$.
    - (b) $\langle |M\beta^j_S|^{p_j} \rangle_Q \lesssim \delta^{-1}\mathbf{A}^{p_j}$.
    - (c) $\langle |T^j\beta^j_S|^{p'_k} \rangle_Q \lesssim \delta^{-1}\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}}^{p'_k} + \upsilon_1^{p'_k}\mathbf{T}^{p'_k}$,

where $\{j,k\} = \{1,2\}$. Finally,

$$\mathbb{E}^k |B^{j,A}| \lesssim \upsilon_1^{-p_j} 2^{-c\epsilon r} |Q^0|\,. \tag{2.23}$$

Proof. It is immediate from Definition (2.18) that $|S| = \int_S b^j_S \, dx = \int_S \beta^j_S \, dx$, so claim (1) follows. By the boundedness of martingale transforms, claim (2) is also clear:

$$\int_S |\beta^j_S|^{p_j} \, dx \lesssim \int_S |b^j_S|^{p_j} \, dx \leq \mathbf{A}^{p_j} |S|\,.$$

The properties in (3a)—(3c) are a consequence of equation (2.21) and the failure of condition defining Type A cubes. Indeed, if $Q \in \mathcal{R}^j$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} Q = S$,

$$\langle \beta^j_S \rangle_Q \geq \langle b^j_S \rangle_Q - \langle |M \widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p_j} \rangle_Q^{1/p_j} \geq \tfrac{1}{2} - \upsilon_1 ,$$

which is greater than 1/4. (Recall that stopping data is slightly stronger on this point.) If Q is a child of a cube in $\mathcal{R}^j$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} Q = S$, then either $Q \in \mathcal{S}^j$, in which case $\langle \beta^j_S \rangle_Q = \langle \beta^j_Q \rangle_Q = 1$, or the estimate follows as above by first comparing the average of $|\widetilde{\beta}^j_S|$ on Q to its average on πQ. Let us then consider (3b) and (3c) for $Q \in \mathcal{R}^j$. By sub-linearity and stopping rules,

$$\langle |M \beta^j_S|^{p_j} \rangle_Q \lesssim \langle |M b^j_S|^{p_j} \rangle_Q + \langle |M \widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p_j} \rangle_Q \leq \delta^{-1} \mathbf{A}^{p_j} + \upsilon_1^{p_j} \lesssim \delta^{-1} \mathbf{A}^{p_j} .$$

Likewise,

$$\langle |T^j \beta^j_S|^{p'_k} \rangle_Q \lesssim \langle |T^j b^j_S|^{p'_k} \rangle_Q + \langle |T^j \widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p'_k} \rangle_Q \leq \delta^{-1} \mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}}^{p'_k} + \upsilon_1^{p'_k} \mathbf{T}^{p'_k} .$$

The claims for a child Q of a cube in $\mathcal{R}^j$ follow by comparing the average on Q to that on πQ, in case of $Q \notin \mathcal{S}^j$, and from the stopping rules in case of $Q \in \mathcal{S}^j$.

Turning to inequality (2.23), i.e. showing that the set $B^{j,A}$ has small expected measure, recall that the collection $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ is only a function of ω^j. Moreover, by sparsness of this collection,

$$\sum_{S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} |S| \lesssim \frac{1}{1-\tau} |Q^0| \lesssim |Q^0| .$$

A cube is of Type A for four potential reasons. Fix $S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$, and let $\mathcal{B}^{j,A_1}_S$ be the maximal cubes $Q \in \mathcal{A}^j$ with $\pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q = S$, and $\langle |M \widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p_j} \rangle_Q \geq \upsilon_1^{p_j}$. By Lemma 2.19,

$$\mathbb{E}^k \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{B}^{j,A_1}_S} |Q| \lesssim \upsilon_1^{-p_j} \mathbb{E}^k \int_S |\widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p_j} \lesssim \upsilon_1^{-p_j} 2^{-c\epsilon r} |S| .$$

Second, let $\mathcal{B}^{j,A_2}_S$ be the maximal cubes $Q \in \mathcal{A}_j$ with $\pi_{\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} Q = S$, and $\langle |T^j \widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p'_k} \rangle_Q \geq \mathbf{T}^{p'_k} \upsilon_1^{p'_k}$. Then, using the a priori norm bound $c\mathbf{T}$ for the operator T^j on $L^{p'_k}$ and inequality $p'_k \leq p_j$,

$$\mathbb{E}^k \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{B}^{j,A_2}_S} |Q| \lesssim \upsilon_1^{-p'_k} \cdot \mathbb{E}^k \int_S |\widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p'_k} \lesssim \upsilon_1^{-p_j} 2^{-c\epsilon r} |S| .$$

Third, let $\mathcal{B}^{j,A_3}$ be the collection of cubes Q in $\mathcal{A}^j$, having a child $S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ with $\langle |M \widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p_j} \rangle_S \geq \upsilon_1^{p_j}$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}^k \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{B}^{j,A_3}} |Q| \lesssim \upsilon_1^{-p_j} \sum_{S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} \mathbb{E}^k \int_S |\widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p_j} \lesssim \upsilon_1^{-p_j} 2^{-c\epsilon r} \sum_{S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} |S| \lesssim \upsilon_1^{-p_j} 2^{-c\epsilon r} |Q^0| .$$

A similar estimate for the remaining collection $\mathcal{B}^{j,A_4}$ of cubes Q in $\mathcal{A}^j$, having a child $S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ such that $\langle |T^j \widetilde{\beta}^j_S|^{p_k'}\rangle_S \ge \upsilon_1^{p_k'} \mathbf{T}^{p_k'}$, finishes the proof of Lemma. □

Let us check conditions (1)—(3) of Lemma 2.10. Every cube $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$ is good by definition and, by construction, $\langle |f_j|\rangle_Q \le \Lambda$. Let us consider the property (3), concerning the sum of half-twisted differences in (2.11). For all $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$ with child Q', and $S \in \mathcal{S}^j$ with $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} Q \subset S$, there holds $|\lambda_{Q'}| \lesssim \Lambda$, where $\lambda_{Q'}$ is the constant defined by

$$\lambda_{Q'} \mathbf{1}_{Q'} := \mathbf{1}_{Q'} \sum_{\substack{P\in\mathcal{A}^j \,:\, P\supset Q\\ \pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} P = S}} \widetilde{D}_P^{\beta^j} f_j \,.$$

In contrast to the sum in (2.11), the sum above extends over *all cubes* with the same $\mathcal{S}^j$ parent. Hence, by inspection of (2.9), the sum above is telescoping to the difference of two ratios (or to a single ratio). On the numerator of the ratios, are averages of f_j, which are bounded by the definition of Type C. The denominator of the ratios is an average of β^j_S, which is bounded below by 1/4 because of condition (3a) in Lemma 2.22. Hence, $|\lambda_{Q'}| \lesssim \Lambda$. Finally, let P be a bad cube in the sum above, then $P \in \mathcal{R}^j$ and it has no stopping children in $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ by construction. By property (2.21) and Proposition 2.20, we find that $\widetilde{D}_P^{\beta^j} f_j \equiv 0$. Thus, (2.11) holds.

2.6. **Completion of the proof of Lemma 2.10.**

The remainder of the proof of Lemma 2.10 is taken up with the proof of (2.12). This inequality implies that it suffices to bound the sum over the collection $\mathcal{G}^1 \times \mathcal{G}^2$, compare to inequality (2.13). Let us begin with probability statements involving smallness of sets B^j.

We have seen that $B^{j,A}$ has small measure on expectation. The same fact for $B^{j,B}$ is straight forward. Indeed, the collection $\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ is only a function of ω^j, and holding that variable fixed, the event that $S \in \widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j$ has a bad parent is an event in Ω^k, where $\{j,k\} = \{1,2\}$. And so,

$$\mathbb{E}^k|B^{j,B}| \le 2^n \cdot \mathbb{E}^k \sum_{S\in\widetilde{\mathcal{S}}^j} |S| \mathbf{1}_{\pi S \text{ is bad}} \lesssim \frac{1}{1-\tau} 2^{-\epsilon r}|Q^0| \lesssim 2^{-\epsilon r}|Q^0| \,. \tag{2.24}$$

For the remaining set $B^{j,C}$, recall that f_j is a dyadic BMO function, uniformly over ω^1 and ω^2. More precisely, by Chebyshev's inequality and (2.6), we have

$$|B^{j,C}| = \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{B}^{j,C}} |Q| \le |\{Mf_j > \Lambda\}| \le \Lambda^{-2p_j}\|Mf_j\|_{2p_j}^{2p_j} \lesssim \Lambda^{-2p_j}|Q^0| \,. \tag{2.25}$$

We have verified that

$$\mathbb{E}|B^j| = \mathbb{E}^j\mathbb{E}^k|B^j| \lesssim \{\Lambda^{-2p_j} + \upsilon_1^{-p_j} 2^{-c\epsilon r}\}|Q^0| \,. \tag{2.26}$$

Indeed, this follows by combining inequalities (2.23), (2.24), and (2.25).

We turn to a variant of Lemma 2.17, adapted to our construction. Since we have truncated our stopping tree, the statement is not as clean. We need to define $\phi^j := \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{B}^j} \phi^j_Q$, where $\phi^j_Q = f_j\mathbf{1}_Q$ if $Q\in\mathcal{B}^j\cap\mathcal{A}^j_*$ and, otherwise,

$$\phi^j_Q := f_j\mathbf{1}_Q - \frac{\langle f_j\rangle_Q}{\langle \beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q}\rangle_Q}\beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q}\mathbf{1}_Q\,.$$

We claim that

$$\|\phi^j\|_{p_j}^{p_j} \lesssim \Lambda^{p_j}|B^j|\,. \tag{2.27}$$

Recall that B^j is a function of (ω^1,ω^2) and is of small measure in expectation. Let us prove inequality (2.27). If $Q\in\mathcal{B}^j\cap\mathcal{A}^j_*$ then, by (2.6), $\|\phi^j_Q\|_{p_j}\lesssim|Q^0|^{1/p_j}\lesssim|B^j|^{1/p_j}$. There are at most 2^n such cubes. For the remaining terms, we notice that as f_j is BMO, and the average values of f_j are controlled,

$$\begin{aligned}\Big\|\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{B}^j\setminus\mathcal{A}^j_*}\phi^j_Q\Big\|_{p_j}^{p_j} &= \sum_Q\Big\|f_j\mathbf{1}_Q - \frac{\langle f_j\rangle_Q}{\langle \beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q}\rangle_Q}\beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q}\mathbf{1}_Q\Big\|_{p_j}^{p_j}\\ &\lesssim \sum_Q\Big\{\|f_j\mathbf{1}_Q-\langle f_j\rangle_Q\mathbf{1}_Q\|_{p_j}^{p_j} + \Big\|\langle f_j\rangle_Q\mathbf{1}_Q - \frac{\langle f_j\rangle_Q}{\langle \beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q}\rangle_Q}\beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}Q}\mathbf{1}_Q\Big\|_{p_j}^{p_j}\Big\}\\ &\lesssim \Lambda^{p_j}\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{B}^j\setminus\mathcal{A}^j_*}|Q| \le \Lambda^{p_j}|B^j|\,.\end{aligned}\tag{2.28}$$

We used definition of Type C cubes and Lemma 2.22, along with the observation that the parent of Q is in $\mathcal{R}^j$ if $Q\in\mathcal{B}^j\setminus\mathcal{A}^j_*$. This concludes the proof of inequality (2.27).

Concerning the representation of f_j, we have

2.29. **Lemma.** *The following equality holds almost everywhere and in* L^{p_j}*.*

$$f_j(x) = \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{A}^j_*\setminus\mathcal{B}^j}\langle f_j\rangle_Q\beta^j_Q(x) + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{G}^j}\Delta^{\beta^j}_Q f_j(x) + \phi^j(x)\,. \tag{2.30}$$

Proof. Let Q be any bad cube, which is not contained in a cube in $\mathcal{B}^j$. By construction and Proposition 2.20, $\Delta^{\beta^j}_Q f_j\equiv 0$. It follows that for any $x\in B_j$, the sum above is in fact finite, and telescoping. By inspection, it is equal to $f_j(x)$.

Consider $x\notin Bj$, then note that for any cube $P\ni x$,

$$\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{A}^j_*\setminus\mathcal{B}^j}\langle f_j\rangle_Q\beta^j_Q(x) + \sum_{Q\in\mathcal{G}^j\,:\,P\subsetneq Q}\Delta^{\beta^j}_Q f_j(x) = \frac{\langle f_j\rangle_P}{\langle\beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}_j}P}\rangle_P}\beta^j_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j}P}(x)\,.$$

Now, since $\mathcal{S}^j$ is sparse, almost every x is in only a finite number of cubes $S \in \mathcal{S}^j$. Hence, for all P sufficiently small, as a function of S, $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} P = S$ does not change. And, by the martingale convergence theorem, for almost every $x \in S$,

$$\langle \beta^j_S \rangle_P \longrightarrow \beta^j_S(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle f_j \rangle_P \longrightarrow f_j(x)\,.$$

The convergence is as $\ell P \longrightarrow 0$, with $x \in P$. The convergence is in L^{p_j}. Moreover, by the stopping rules, the averages of β^j_S are bounded from above and below, so that L^{p_j} convergence also holds for the inverses as well. □

We can conclude the proof of Lemma 2.10 this way. It remains to verify (2.12). In expanding $\langle Tf_1, f_2 \rangle$ using (2.30), there are a number of terms. Note that we have these estimates, and their duals, as applicable, which we do not directly state. For $P \in \mathcal{A}^1_* \setminus \mathcal{B}^1$, the cubes P and Q^0 are roughly of the same size, so that $|\langle f_1 \rangle_P| \lesssim 1$ by inequality (2.6). Furthermore, using the local Tb hypothesis, definition of Type A cubes, and the Hardy inequality stated in Lemma 3.17,

$$|\langle T\beta^1_P, f_2 \rangle| \le |\langle T\beta^1_P, f_2 \mathbf{1}_P \rangle| + |\langle T\beta^1_P, f_2 \mathbf{1}_{6P \setminus P} \rangle| \lesssim \{1 + \mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}} + \upsilon_1 \mathbf{T}\} |Q^0|\,.$$

And for $P \in \mathcal{A}^1_* \setminus \mathcal{B}^1$, and $Q \in \mathcal{A}^2_* \setminus \mathcal{B}^2$, by the same reasoning, we have

$$|\langle T\beta^1_P, \beta^2_Q \rangle| \lesssim \{1 + \mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}} + \upsilon_1 \mathbf{T}\} |Q^0|\,.$$

Next, for P as above, there holds by the assumed norm inequality on T, and inequalities (2.27) and (2.26),

$$\mathbb{E}\big\{ |\langle T\beta^1_P, \phi^2 \rangle| + |\langle T\phi^1, f_2 \rangle| \big\} \lesssim \mathbf{T} \cdot \{\Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda \upsilon_1^{-1} \cdot 2^{-c\epsilon r}\} \cdot |Q^0|\,.$$

Lastly, when $\Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda \upsilon_1^{-1} 2^{-c\epsilon r} < 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |\langle T\phi^1, \phi^2 \rangle| \lesssim \mathbf{T} \cdot \{\Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda \upsilon_1^{-1} \cdot 2^{-c\epsilon r}\} \cdot |Q^0|\,.$$

Collectively, combined with (2.6), these inequalities complete the proof of (2.12).

3. USEFUL INEQUALITIES

3.1. **The Martingale Transform Inequalities.** We recall essential tools that we will need. Fix a function b supported on a dyadic[1] cube S_0, satisfying $\int b \; dx = |S_0|$, and $\|b\|_p \le \mathbf{B} |S_0|^{1/p}$, where $1 < p < \infty$ is fixed. We will consider a fixed but arbitrary collection $\mathcal{T}$ of disjoint dyadic cubes in S_0, the 'terminal cubes'. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be all dyadic cubes, contained in S_0, but not contained in any terminal cube $T \in \mathcal{T}$. We require that there is $\sigma \in (0,1)$ such that, for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$,

---

[1] In our applications, the underlying dyadic system will be $\mathcal{D}^j$, $j \in \{1, 2\}$.

$$\Bigl|\int_Q b\; dx\Bigr| \geq 4^{-1}|Q| \quad \text{and} \quad \int_Q |b|^p\, dx \leq \sigma^{-1}\mathbf{B}^p|Q|\,. \tag{3.1}$$

For each terminal cube T, we have a function b_T supported on T, and satisfying $\int b_T\; dx = |T|$ and $\|b_T\|_p \leq \mathbf{B}|T|^{1/p}$. If the conditions above are met, then we say that the collection, comprised of functions b and b_T, $T \in \mathcal{T}$, is *admissible*. We will not keep track of the constants σ and $\mathbf{B}$, and the implied constants will depend upon them.

For $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ we define the *(half) twisted martingale differences*

$$D_Q^b f := \sum_{Q' \in \operatorname{ch}(Q) \setminus \mathcal{T}} \Bigl\{ \frac{\langle f \rangle_{Q'}}{\langle b \rangle_{Q'}} - \frac{\langle f \rangle_{Q}}{\langle b \rangle_{Q}} \Bigr\} \mathbf{1}_{Q'}\,,$$

$$\widetilde{D}_Q^b f := \Bigl\{ \sum_{Q' \in \operatorname{ch}(Q) \setminus \mathcal{T}} \frac{\langle f \rangle_{Q'}}{\langle b \rangle_{Q'}} \mathbf{1}_{Q'} \Bigr\} - \frac{\langle f \rangle_{Q}}{\langle b \rangle_{Q}} \mathbf{1}_{Q}\,,$$

$$\Delta_Q^b f := \sum_{Q' \in \operatorname{ch}(Q)} \Bigl\{ \frac{\langle f \rangle_{Q'}}{\langle b_{Q'} \rangle_{Q'}} b_{Q'} - \frac{\langle f \rangle_{Q}}{\langle b \rangle_{Q}} b \Bigr\} \mathbf{1}_{Q'}\,,$$

where we set $b_{Q'} = b$ if $Q' \notin \mathcal{T}$ and otherwise, $b_{Q'}$ is defined as above.

This is proved in [2, Lemma 5.3] and [19, Section 2].

3.2. **Theorem.** *Suppose that* b *and* b_T, $T \in \mathcal{T}$, *constitutes an admissible collection. Then, these inequalities hold for all selection of constants* $|\varepsilon_Q| \leq 1$.

$$\Bigl\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \varepsilon_Q \widetilde{D}_Q^b f \Bigr\|_q + \Bigl\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \varepsilon_Q D_Q^b f \Bigr\|_q \lesssim \|f\|_q\,, \qquad 1 < q < \infty\,,$$

$$\Bigl\| \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}} \varepsilon_Q \Delta_Q^b f \Bigr\|_p \lesssim \|f\|_p\,,$$

where $1 < p < \infty$ *is the exponent associated with the admissible function* b.

We will recourse to the following Theorem several times. Aside from Theorem 3.2, it depends upon the sparseness of the stopping tree $\mathcal{S}^j$.

3.3. **Theorem.** *For each cube* Q *in* $\mathbf{R}^n$, *and any selection of coefficients* $|\varepsilon_P| \lesssim 1$,

$$\Bigl\| \sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}^j \,:\, P \subset Q} \varepsilon_P \Delta_P^{\beta^j} f_j \Bigr\|_{p_j} \lesssim |Q|^{1/p_j}\,. \tag{3.4}$$

The same statement holds true also with $\Delta_P^{\beta^j}$ *replaced by* $\Delta_P^{b^j}$.

Before the proof of Theorem, let us make the following instructive remark.

3.5. *Remark.* Of particular importance in the sequel will be the following assignments. For a fixed $S_0 \in \mathcal{S}^j$ that is not contained in a cube in $\mathcal{B}^j$, we set $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{D}^j$ to be maximal cubes in the collection

$$\mathrm{ch}_{\mathcal{S}^j}(S_0) \cup \{T : T \subset S_0,\, T \in \mathrm{ch}(R),\, R \in \mathcal{B}^j\}.$$

By construction of our perturbed stopping data, it is straight forward to verify that the assignments $\beta := \beta^j_{S_0}$ and

$$\beta_T := \begin{cases} b^j_T & T \in \mathrm{ch}(R) \text{ for some } R \in \mathcal{B}^j \\ \beta^j_T & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

yields an admissible collection, with $p = p_j$ and constants $\sigma \simeq \delta$ and $\mathbf{B} \simeq \mathbf{A}$. Likewise, setting $b := b^j_{S_0}$ and $b_T := b^j_T$ if $T \in \mathcal{T}$ yields admissible functions. Observe also that $P \in \mathcal{Q}$ if $P \in \mathcal{G}^j$ satisfies $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} P = S_0$. Moreover, under the same assumption, $\Delta^\beta_P = \Delta^{\beta^j}_P$ and $\Delta^b_P = \Delta^{b^j}_P$. Here, the right hand sides are defined in (2.8). Observe that the terminal functions β_T and b_T for $T \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathrm{ch}(R)$, $R \in \mathcal{B}^j$, do not play any role in these last identities.

Proof of Theorem 3.3. By considering the disjoint collection of those maximal cubes in $\mathcal{G}^j$, that are contained in Q, we are reduced to the case of $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$. By Theorem 3.2 and Remark 3.5, we first obtain a weaker inequality. Indeed, letting $S = \pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} Q$, we have

$$\Big\| \sum_{\substack{P : \pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} P = S \\ P \subset Q}} \varepsilon_P \Delta^{\beta^j}_P f_j \Big\|_{p_j} \lesssim \|f_j \mathbf{1}_Q\|_{p_j} \lesssim |Q|^{1/p_j} . \tag{3.6}$$

We have the last inequality due to the construction of functions f_j:—compare to inequalities in (2.28) and recall the normalization of f_j by Λ^{-1}.

We apply inequality (3.6) recursively for the remaining terms, for which $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} P \subsetneq Q$. Let $\mathcal{R}_1$ be the maximal $R \in \mathcal{S}^j$ strictly contained in Q, and inductively set $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ to be the maximal cubes $R' \in \mathcal{S}^j$ strictly contained in any $R \in \mathcal{R}_k$. By sparsness of $\mathcal{S}^j$,

$$\sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}_{k+1}} |R| \le \tau \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}_k} |R| \le \cdots \le \tau^k |Q| , \qquad k \ge 1 ,$$

where $0 < \tau < 1$. Thus, setting $\phi_k := \sum_{R \in \mathcal{R}_k} \sum_{P : \pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} P = R} \varepsilon_P \Delta^{\beta^j}_P f_j$, there holds

$$\Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \phi_k \Big\|_{p_j} = \Big\| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{1-1} \phi_k \Big\|_{p_j}$$

$$\lesssim \Big[\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-p_j'}\Big]^{1/p_j'} \Big[\sum_k k^{p_j}\|\phi_k\|_{p_j}^{p_j}\Big]^{1/p_j} \lesssim |Q|^{1/p_j}\,.$$

The proof in case of b^j-functions is the same. □

We need a variant of the q-universal inequality for the half-twisted differences to control several error terms that arise. For $P \in \mathcal{G}^j$, let us define

$$\text{(3.7)}\qquad \square_P^{\beta^j} f_j := |\widetilde{D}_P^{\beta^j} f_j| + \widetilde{\chi}_P\,,$$

where

$$\widetilde{\chi}_P := \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}_P & \text{a child of } P \text{ is in } \mathcal{S}^j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The functions $\square_P^{b^j} f_j$ are defined analogously. If the applied function β^j or b^j is clear from the context, we omit the superscripts. The following q-universal inequality is a consequence of sparsness of the stopping cubes $\mathcal{S}^j$ and the half-twisted inequality, Theorem 3.2.

$$\text{(3.8)}\qquad \Big\|\Big[\sum_{P\in\mathcal{G}^j\,:\,P\subset Q} |\square_P^{\beta^j} f_j|^2\Big]^{1/2}\Big\|_q \lesssim |Q|^{1/q}\,,\qquad 1<q<\infty\,.$$

Here Q is any cube in $\mathbf{R}^n$, and the same inequality is true if we use b^j-functions.

For further details concerning the proof of (3.8), we refer to [19, Section 5].

3.2. **An Estimate for Perturbations of b.**

For a later discussion of the diagonal term in §5.1, we need novel *perturbation inequalities* for the twisted martingale differences. We will first formulate and prove general statements, and only afterwards specialize to our setting.

Let S_0 be a dyadic cube, and $\mathcal{T}$ be a collection of disjoint dyadic subcubes of S_0. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the collection of all dyadic subcubes of S_0 which are not contained in any $T \in \mathcal{T}$. We suppose there are two admissible collections of functions[2]: b and β, and the corresponding terminal functions b_T and β_T for each $T \in \mathcal{T}$; for the definitions, we refer to §3.1. Assume further that for all $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $T \in \mathcal{T}$ there holds, for a fixed $0 < \upsilon < 8^{-1}$,

$$\text{(3.9)}\qquad \int_Q |b-\beta|^p\,dx \le \upsilon^p|Q|\,,\qquad \int_T |b_T-\beta_T|^p \le \upsilon^p|T|\,.$$

These conditions say that b and β, and the corresponding terminal functions, are ‘close’.

---

[2] With exponent p and constants $\sigma, \mathbf{B}$

3.10. **Theorem.** *Suppose inequalities* (3.9) *hold for some* $0 < \upsilon < 8^{-1}$, *and* $|\langle f\rangle_Q| \le \lambda$ *for every cube* $Q \in \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{T}$. *Then, we have this estimate.*

$$\Big\| \Big[\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} \big| \{ \Delta_Q^{\beta} - \Delta_Q^{b} \} f \big|^2 \Big]^{1/2} \Big\|_p \lesssim \upsilon \cdot \{ \| f \cdot \mathbf{1}_{S_0} \|_p + \lambda |S_0|^{1/p} \} .$$

Here the exponent p *is the one associated with functions* b *and* β, *and the implied constant depends upon* $n, p, \sigma, \mathbf{B}$.

This section is devoted to the proof, which is a variant of known techniques [2, 19]. The proof relies on the crucial martingale transform inequality. Main Lemma follows.

3.11. **Lemma.** *Suppose that* υ *and* f *are as in Theorem 3.10. Then, we have the estimate*

$$\Big\| \Big[\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}} \big| \{ D_Q^{\beta} - D_Q^{b} \} f \big|^2 \Big]^{1/2} \Big\|_p \lesssim \upsilon \cdot \{ \| f \cdot \mathbf{1}_{S_0} \|_p + \lambda |S_0|^{1/p} \} . \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. We begin with preparations. Fix $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and $Q' \in \mathrm{ch}(Q) \setminus \mathcal{T}$. Set $\widetilde{\beta} = b - \beta$, and write $\beta_{k,Q} := (\langle \widetilde{\beta}\rangle_Q / \langle \beta \rangle_Q)^k$. Define $\beta_{k,Q'}$ analogously. Observe the inequalities for every $k \ge 1$.

$$|\beta_{k,Q'}| + |\beta_{k,Q}| \le 2 \cdot (4\upsilon)^k, \qquad |\beta_{k,Q'} - \beta_{k,Q}| \le |\beta_{1,Q'} - \beta_{1,Q}| \cdot k \cdot (8\upsilon)^{k-1} . \tag{3.13}$$

Indeed, these follow from inequalities (3.1) and (3.9), and the fact that $Q, Q' \in \mathcal{Q}$. For the latter inequality above, one also applies the Mean Value Theorem.

Then we write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\langle \beta\rangle_Q} - \frac{1}{\langle b\rangle_Q} &= \frac{1}{\langle \beta\rangle_Q} \Big\{ 1 - \frac{\langle \beta\rangle_Q}{\langle \beta\rangle_Q + \langle \widetilde{\beta}\rangle_Q} \Big\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\langle \beta\rangle_Q} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{k+1} \beta_{k,Q} . \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Using the same expansion with Q replaced by Q' yields inequality

$$\big| \{ D_Q^{\beta} - D_Q^{b} \} f \big| \cdot \mathbf{1}_{Q'} \le \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \Big| \frac{\langle f\rangle_{Q'}}{\langle \beta\rangle_{Q'}} \beta_{k,Q'} - \frac{\langle f\rangle_Q}{\langle \beta\rangle_Q} \beta_{k,Q} \Big| \cdot \mathbf{1}_{Q'} .$$

Then, for a fixed k, write the summand on the right hand side as

$$\begin{aligned} &\Big| \beta_{k,Q} D_Q^{\beta} f \cdot \mathbf{1}_{Q'} + \frac{\langle f\rangle_{Q'}}{\langle \beta\rangle_{Q'}} \{ \beta_{k,Q'} - \beta_{k,Q} \} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{Q'} \Big| \\ &\le 2(4\upsilon)^k \cdot |D_Q^{\beta} f| \cdot \mathbf{1}_{Q'} + 4\lambda \cdot k \cdot (8\upsilon)^{k-1} \cdot |\beta_{1,Q'} - \beta_{1,Q}| \cdot \mathbf{1}_{Q'} . \end{aligned}$$

Here we used assumptions and inequalities (3.13). Observe that $|\beta_{1,Q'}-\beta_{1,Q}|\cdot\mathbf{1}_{Q'}=|D_Q^{\beta}\widetilde{\beta}|\cdot\mathbf{1}_{Q'}$. By summing the series over k, and then summing resulting estimates over $Q'\in\mathrm{ch}(Q)\setminus\mathcal{T}$,

$$\left|\{D_Q^{\beta}-D_Q^{b}\}f\right|\lesssim\upsilon|D_Q^{\beta}f|+\lambda|D_Q^{\beta}\widetilde{\beta}|=\upsilon|D_Q^{\beta}(f\cdot\mathbf{1}_{S_0})|+\lambda|D_Q^{\beta}(\widetilde{\beta}\cdot\mathbf{1}_{S_0})|\,.$$

Inequality (3.12) follows by using (3.9) and universal martingale transform inequalities with $q=p$, Theorem 3.2. □

Proof of Theorem 3.10. For $Q\in\mathcal{Q}$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}&\Delta_Q^{\beta}f-\Delta_Q^{b}f\\&=\left\{D_Q^{\beta}f-D_Q^{b}f\right\}\cdot b+D_Q^{\beta}f\cdot(\beta-b)+\sum_{Q'\in\mathrm{ch}(Q)\cap\mathcal{T}}\left\{F_{Q'}^{1}-F_{Q'}^{2}-F_{Q'}^{3}\right\}\cdot\mathbf{1}_{Q'}\,,\end{aligned}$$

where we have denoted

$$\begin{aligned}&F_{Q'}^{1}:=\langle f\rangle_{Q'}\cdot\{\beta_{Q'}-b_{Q'}\}\,,\\&F_{Q'}^{2}:=\langle f\rangle_{Q}\cdot\left\{\frac{1}{\langle\beta\rangle_Q}-\frac{1}{\langle b\rangle_Q}\right\}\cdot b,\quad F_{Q'}^{3}:=\langle f\rangle_{Q}\cdot\frac{1}{\langle\beta\rangle_Q}\{\beta-b\}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Having Lemma 3.11 and martingale difference inequalities, we can proceed as in [19, Section 2]. For the convenience of the reader, we briefly recall this argument here. Let

$$Sf:=\left[\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{Q}}\left|D_Q^{\beta}(f\cdot\mathbf{1}_{S_0})\right|^2\right]^{1/2},$$

and consider the events $E_t:=\{|Sf|\geq t\}\subset S_0$, where $t>0$. It is crucial to realize that we can compare Lebesgue measure estimates and estimates with respect to $|\beta-b|^p\,dx$. Namely, by inequality (3.9), the Lebesgue Differentiation Theorem, and the fact that Sf is constant on terminal cubes $T\in\mathcal{T}$,

$$\int_{E_t}|\beta-b|^p\,dx\leq 2^n\upsilon^p|E_t|.$$

Therefore, by a standard formula and the Lebesgue measure estimates of Theorem 3.2,

$$\int_{S_0}|Sf|^p|\beta-b|^p\,dx=p\int_0^{\infty}t^{p-1}\int_{E_t}|\beta-b|^p\,dx\,dt\lesssim\upsilon^p\|f\cdot\mathbf{1}_{S_0}\|_p^p\,.$$

The square function of $\left\{D_Q^{\beta}f-D_Q^{b}f\right\}\cdot b$ is estimated analogously, using Lemma 3.11, which also contributes the constant υ. The remaining square functions, associated with $F_{Q'}^{i}$, $i=1,2,3$, are estimated by using the fact that $\mathcal{T}$ is a disjoint collection and Lebesgue measure is doubling. In case of $i=2$, we also use expansion (3.14) and first inequality in (3.13). □

We specialize the perturbation inequalities to our setting.

3.15. **Theorem.** *For* $j = 1, 2$ *and* $0 < \upsilon_1 < 4^{-1-n}$, *we have this estimate.*

$$\Big\| \Big[\sum_{Q\in\mathcal{G}^j} \big| \{\Delta_Q^{\beta^j} - \Delta_Q^{b^j}\} f_j \big|^2 \Big]^{1/2} \Big\|_{p_j} \lesssim \upsilon_1 |Q^0|^{1/p_j} \,. \tag{3.16}$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{A}^j_*$, and inductively set $\mathcal{R}_{k+1}$ to be the maximal cubes $S' \in \mathcal{S}^j$ strictly contained in any $S \in \mathcal{R}_k$. By sparseness of $\mathcal{S}^j$,

$$\sum_{S\in\mathcal{R}^k} |S| \lesssim \tau^k |Q^0| \,, \quad k \geq 0 \,.$$

By disjointness of each collection $\mathcal{R}^k$, the left hand side of (3.16) is bounded by

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \Big[\sum_{S\in\mathcal{R}^k} \Big\| \Big[\sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{G}^j\\ \pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} Q = S}} \big| \{\Delta_Q^{\beta^j} - \Delta_Q^{b^j}\} f_j \big|^2 \Big]^{1/2} \Big\|_{p_j}^{p_j} \Big]^{1/p_j} \,.$$

Fix $k \geq 0$ and $S_0 = S \in \mathcal{R}^k$. The basic reduction to a square function involving cubes $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$ and differences Δ_Q^{β} and Δ_Q^{b} is described in Remark 3.5. We apply Theorem 3.10, and therefore we need to verify that its assumptions are satisfied.

To this end, we can clearly assume that there is a cube $Q \in \mathcal{G}^j$ such that $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^j} Q = S_0$. As a consequence, $S_0 \in \mathcal{S}^j$ is not contained in any cube in $\mathcal{B}^j$, and a case study using definition of Type C cubes shows that $|\langle f_j \rangle_Q| \lesssim 1$ if $Q \in \mathcal{Q} \cup \mathcal{T}$ and $\|f_j \cdot \mathbf{1}_{S_0}\|_{p_j} \lesssim |S_0|^{1/p_j}$ (recall that f_j is in dyadic BMO and the normalization by Λ^{-1} takes place). Moreover, the same fact about S_0 combined with definition of Type A cubes implies that

$$\int_Q |b - \beta|^p = \int_Q |\widetilde{\beta}^j_{S_0}|^{p_j} \leq 2^n \upsilon_1^{p_j} |Q| \,, \qquad Q \in \mathcal{Q} \,.$$

For the second condition in (3.9) for $T \in \mathcal{T}$, we first observe that $b_T - \beta_T = 0$ if T is a child of a cube in $\mathcal{B}^j$. In complementary case, $T \in \mathrm{ch}_{\mathcal{S}^j}(S_0)$, and its parent is not contained in any cube in $\mathcal{B}^j$. Thus,

$$\int_T |b_T - \beta_T|^p = \int_T |\widetilde{\beta}^j_T|^{p_j} \leq \upsilon_1^{p_j} |T|$$

by definition of Type A cubes.

The proof is finished by using Theorem 3.10 and appealing to previous inequalities. □

3.3. **Hardy Inequality.** We record a Hardy inequality that we will refer to several times. For a proof, we refer to [2, Section 9].

3.17. **Lemma.** *Let* Q *be any cube in* $\mathbf{R}^n$ *and* $\kappa > 1$. *For every* $1 < p < \infty$, *there holds*

$$\int_{\kappa Q \setminus Q} \int_Q \frac{|\phi_1(y)\phi_2(x)|}{|x-y|^n}\, dy dx \lesssim \|\phi_1\|_p \|\phi_2\|_{p'}\,, \qquad 1/p + 1/p' = 1\,.$$

The implied constant depends upon κ, p, n.

4. The Inner Product and the Main Term

During the course of the remaining sections, we prove inequality (2.13), which then completes the proof of our main result, Theorem 1.2. The sum in (2.13) is further split into dual triangular sums, one of which is the sum over $(P,Q) \in \mathcal{G}^1 \times \mathcal{G}^2$ such that $\ell P \geq \ell Q$. By using goodness, this sum is further decomposed into different parts, as below.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_{\textrm{far}} &:= \{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{G}^1 \times \mathcal{G}^2 \;:\; 3P \cap Q = \emptyset\,, \ell Q \leq \ell P\} \\
\mathcal{P}_{\textrm{diagonal}} &:= \{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{G}^1 \times \mathcal{G}^2 \setminus \mathcal{P}_{\textrm{far}} \;:\; 2^{-r}\ell P \leq \ell Q \leq \ell P\} \\
\mathcal{P}_{\textrm{nearby}} &:= \{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{G}^1 \times \mathcal{G}^2 \setminus \mathcal{P}_{\textrm{diagonal}} \;:\; Q \subset 3P \setminus P\} \\
\mathcal{P}_{\textrm{inside}} &:= \{(P,Q) \in \mathcal{G}^1 \times \mathcal{G}^2 \setminus \mathcal{P}_{\textrm{diagonal}} \;:\; Q \subset P\}
\end{aligned}$$

The sums over these collections of pairs of cubes are handled separately, and aside from the 'inside' term, one can sum over the absolute value of the inner products.

The main tools to control these terms are the twisted martingale transform inequality combined with the local Tb hypothesis. Moreover, all cubes are good, a point used systematically, but not so noted in the notation. It is frequently combined with the smoothness condition on the kernel, to see that certain maximal functions applied to the β functions appear. That these maximal functions are controlled is a consequence of the selection of stopping cubes, combined with the universal half-twisted martingale inequalities. In the analysis of the diagonal term, the perturbation inequalities established in §3 play a key role. We recall that the functions f_j have been normalized, allowing us to assume that $\Lambda = 1$.

In this section, we concentrate on the 'inside' term, which is the main term.

The condition for $(P,Q) \in \mathcal{P}_{\textrm{inside}}$ is that $Q \subset P$ and $2^r \ell Q < \ell P$, which are abbreviated to $Q \Subset P$ below. Even though Q is in a different grid, it is good, hence necessarily a child of P contains it, and we denote that child by P_Q. A book keeping issue motivates the next steps. Set

$\widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1 := \widetilde{D}_P f_1 \cdot \beta^1_{\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1} P}$, where the half-twisted martingale difference $\widetilde{D}_P = \widetilde{D}_P^{\beta^1}$ of (2.9), does not sum over of the children of P that have a different stopping parent from that of P.

It suffices to bound the sum over $S \in \mathcal{S}^1$ of the terms

$$\Bigl| \mathbf{1}_{\{S \notin \mathcal{A}^1_*\}} \cdot \sum_{Q\,:\,Q \Subset \pi S} \langle f_1 \rangle_S \langle T\beta^1_S, \Delta_Q f_2 \rangle \Bigr| + \Bigl| \sum_{P\,:\,\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1} P = S} \; \sum_{Q\,:\,Q \Subset P} \langle T \widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1, \Delta_Q f_2 \rangle \Bigr| . \tag{4.1}$$

The point of this step is that the argument of T depends only on β^1_S. The required bound is

$$(4.1) \lesssim \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\mathsf{loc}} |S| , \qquad \widetilde{\mathbf{T}} := \mathbf{T}_{\mathsf{loc}} + \upsilon_1 \mathbf{T} ,$$

which is essentially the term that appears in Lemma 2.22, condition (3c), and the implied constant is not allowed to depend upon the absorption parameters. Since the collection $\mathcal{S}^1$ is sparse, this is clearly summable over $S \in \mathcal{S}^1$ to a multiple of $\widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\mathsf{loc}} |Q^0|$.

The first term on the right in (4.1) is easy. First of all, by the the local Tb properties stated in Lemma 2.22, and the twisted martingale inequality (3.4),

$$\Bigl| \mathbf{1}_{\{S \notin \mathcal{A}^1_*\}} \cdot \sum_{\substack{Q\,:\,Q \Subset \pi S \\ Q \subset S}} \langle f_1 \rangle_S \langle T\beta^1_S, \Delta_Q f_2 \rangle \Bigr| \lesssim \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\mathsf{loc}} |S|^{1/p_2'} \Bigl\| \sum_{Q\,:\,Q \Subset \pi S} \langle f_1 \rangle_S \Delta_Q f_2 \Bigr\|_{p_2} \lesssim \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\mathsf{loc}} |S| .$$

The remaining part of the first term is a sum over cubes $Q \Subset \pi S$ for which $Q \cap S = \emptyset$. This part is estimated by using Hardy's inequality, Lemma 3.17, and inequality $p_2' \le p_1$.

For the remaining terms, the argument of T is written this way. With $Q \Subset P$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1 &= \langle \widetilde{D}_P f_1 \rangle_{P_Q} \cdot \beta^1_S \mathbf{1}_S - \langle \widetilde{D}_P f_1 \rangle_{P_Q} \cdot \beta^1_S \mathbf{1}_{S \setminus P_Q} + \widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{P \setminus P_Q} \\ &=: \Delta_P^{\mathsf{para}} f_1 - \Delta_P^{\mathsf{stop}} f_1 + \Delta_P^{\mathsf{error}} f_1 . \end{aligned}$$

Note that we treat $\widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1 \mathbf{1}_{P_Q}$ as the main contribution, but write $\mathbf{1}_{P_Q} = \mathbf{1}_S - \mathbf{1}_{S \setminus P_Q}$. This leads to a decomposition of $B_S(f_1, f_2)$, the second term on display (4.1) without the absolute values, into the paraproduct term, the stopping term, and the error term, written as

$$B_S^{\mathsf{para}}(f_1, f_2) - B_S^{\mathsf{stop}}(f_1, f_2) + B_S^{\mathsf{error}}(f_1, f_2) .$$

The terminology is drawn from [22, 24].

4.1. **Control of the Paraproduct Term.**

This very brief argument is in fact the core of the proof. Consider $B_S^{\mathsf{para}}(f_1, f_2)$. In this term, the argument of T is a certain multiple of β^1_S. For relevant cubes Q, let us define

$$\varepsilon_Q := \sum_{\substack{P\,:\,\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1} P = S \\ Q \Subset P}} \langle \widetilde{D}_P f_1 \rangle_{P_Q} .$$

The condition[3] (2.11) of Lemma 2.10, was designed for the implication that the numbers ε_Q are uniformly bounded. Therefore, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\left|B_S^{\text{para}}(f_1,f_2)\right| &= \Bigl|\sum_{P\,:\,\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1}P=S}\ \sum_{Q\,:\,Q\Subset P}\langle \widetilde{D}_P f_1\rangle_{P_Q}\cdot\langle T\beta_S^1,\Delta_Q f_2\rangle\Bigr| \\ &= \Bigl|\Bigl\langle T\beta_S^1, \sum_{Q\,:\,Q\Subset S}\varepsilon_Q\Delta_Q f_2\Bigr\rangle\Bigr| \\ &\le \|\mathbf{1}_S\cdot T\beta_S^1\|_{p_2'}\Bigl\|\sum_{Q\,:\,Q\Subset S}\varepsilon_Q\Delta_Q f_2\Bigr\|_{p_2} \lesssim \widetilde{\mathbf{T}}_{\text{loc}}|S|\,,\end{aligned}$$

where we have appealed to the local Tb hypothesis, the construction of β_S^1, and the martingale transform inequality (3.4).

4.2. **The Stopping Term.** Recall that

$$B_S^{\text{stop}}(f_1,f_2) = \sum_{P\,:\,\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1}P=S}\ \sum_{Q\,:\,Q\Subset P}\langle \widetilde{D}_P f_1\rangle_{P_Q}\langle T(\beta_S^1\mathbf{1}_{S\setminus P_Q}),\Delta_Q f_2\rangle\,.$$

We bound this by a constant times $|S|$, and to do so we will appeal to (a) that $\Delta_Q f_2$ has integral zero and kernel of T has smoothness, and (b) the universal half-twisted inequality (3.8). This is the argument we will use in those instances when the cubes are relatively close.

For integers $s>r$, we restrict the side length of Q so that $2^s\ell Q=\ell P$, and obtain a further geometric decay in s. Define

$$B_{S,s}^{\text{stop}}(f_1,f_2) := \sum_{P\,:\,\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1}P=S}\ \sum_{\substack{Q\,:\,Q\Subset P\\ 2^s\ell Q=\ell P}}\langle \widetilde{D}_P f_1\rangle_{P_Q}\langle T(\beta_S^1\mathbf{1}_{S\setminus P_Q}),\Delta_Q f_2\rangle$$

By goodness, there holds $\operatorname{dist}(S\setminus P_Q,Q)\ge(\ell Q)^{\epsilon}(\ell P_Q)^{1-\epsilon}$. Therefore, by using the smoothness condition on the kernel, and the mean zero property of $\Delta_Q f_2$, we can estimate the inner product below as follows, in which x_Q is the center of Q.

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle T(\beta_S^1\mathbf{1}_{S\setminus P_Q}),\Delta_Q f_2\rangle| &= \Bigl|\int_Q\int_{S\setminus P_Q}\{K(x,y)-K(x_Q,y)\}\beta_S^1(y)\Delta_Q f_2(x)\;dy\,dx\Bigr| \\ &\lesssim \int_Q\int_{S\setminus P_Q}\frac{(\ell Q)^{\eta}}{|x-y|^{n+\eta}}|\beta_S^1(y)\Delta_Q f_2(x)|\;dy\,dx \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\eta' s}\inf_{x\in Q}M\beta_S^1(x)\cdot\int_Q \square_Q f_2\;dx\end{aligned}$$

---

[3] The condition applies with the minimal cube in $\mathcal{G}^1$, subject to the summation conditions, instead of Q.

This is a standard off-diagonal estimate for singular integrals, combined with the goodness of Q and the corona construction, and we are also using definition (3.7). Observe that we have already gained a geometric decay in s, where $\eta' = (1-\epsilon)\cdot\eta > 0$.

Since cubes Q with same side length, specified by P, are disjoint, there is a simple appeal to Cauchy-Schwarz that we use. Following that, we use the trilinear form of Hölder's inequality, with indices $p_1, 2p_1', 2p_1'$, and the universal half-twisted inequality (3.8).

$$
\begin{aligned}
(4.2)\qquad |B^{\mathrm{stop}}_{S,s}(f_1,f_2)| &\lesssim 2^{-\eta' s} \sum_{P\,:\,\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1}P=S}\ \sum_{\substack{Q\,:\,Q\Subset P\\ 2^s\ell Q=\ell P}} \langle|\widetilde{D}_P f_1|\rangle_P \int_Q M\beta^1_S\cdot \square_Q f_2\,dx\\
&\lesssim 2^{-\eta' s}\int_S M\beta^1_S\Big[\sum_{P\,:\,\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1}P=S}\langle|\widetilde{D}_P f_1|\rangle_P^2\cdot \mathbf{1}_P\Big]^{1/2}\Big[\sum_{Q\,:\,Q\Subset S}|\square_Q f_2|^2\Big]^{1/2}\,dx\\
&\lesssim 2^{-\eta' s}|S|^{1/p_1}\Big\|\Big[\sum_{P\,:\,\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1}P=S}|M\widetilde{D}_P f_1|^2\Big]^{1/2}\Big\|_{2p_1'}\Big\|\Big[\sum_{Q\,:\,Q\Subset S}|\square_Q f_2|^2\Big]^{1/2}\Big\|_{2p_1'}\\
&\lesssim 2^{-\eta' s}|S|\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the analysis of stopping term.

4.3. **The Error Term.**

We control

$$
B^{\mathrm{error}}_S(f_1,f_2) = \sum_{s=r+1}^{\infty}\ \sum_{P\,:\,\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1}P=S}\ \sum_{\substack{Q\,:\,Q\Subset P\\ 2^s\ell Q=\ell P}} \langle T(\widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1\cdot \mathbf{1}_{P\setminus P_Q}), \Delta_Q f_2\rangle\,.
$$

With $s > r$ fixed, call the sum above $B^{\mathrm{error}}_{S,s}(f_1,f_2)$. We obtain a geometric decay in s, by using essentially the same argument as just presented. Indeed,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\langle T(\widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1\cdot \mathbf{1}_{P\setminus P_Q}), \Delta_Q f_2| &= \Big|\int_Q\int_{P\setminus P_Q}\{K(x,y)-K(x_Q,y)\}\widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1(y)\Delta_Q f_2(x)\,dy\,dx\Big|\\
&\lesssim \int_Q\int_{P\setminus P_Q}\frac{(\ell Q)^{\eta}}{|x-y|^{n+\eta}}|\widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1(y)\Delta_Q f_2(x)|\,dy\,dx\\
&\lesssim 2^{-\eta' s}\cdot\langle|\widetilde{D}_P f_1|\rangle_P\cdot \inf_{x\in Q} M\beta^1_S\cdot\int_Q \square_Q f_2\,dx\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

The argument of (4.2) then yields $|B^{\mathrm{error}}_{S,s}(f_1,f_2)| \lesssim 2^{-\eta' s}|S|$.

5. THE REMAINING TERMS

5.1. The Diagonal Term.

The diagonal term is the hardest in many arguments, including ours. The estimate we will prove is of this form.

$$\Big|\sum_{P\in\mathcal{G}^1}\ \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{G}^2\\ Q\cap 3P\neq\emptyset\,,\,2^{-r}\ell P\le\ell Q\le\ell P}} \langle T\Delta_P f_1,\Delta_Q f_2\rangle\Big| \lesssim \big\{C_r(1+\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}})+r\upsilon_1\mathbf{T}\big\}|Q^0|\,. \tag{5.1}$$

Note in particular that the bound in terms of $\mathbf{T}$ has leading absorbing constant $r\upsilon_1$. On the other hand, $\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{loc}}$ has a leading constant C_r that will be exponential in r. The implied constant is independent of the absorption parameters.

The first step in the proof is not so straight forward. Its purpose is to avoid terms $\{2^{cr}\upsilon_1\mathbf{T}\}|Q^0|$ that cannot be absorbed. To explain, let us pass back to the heavier notation $\Delta_P f_1=\Delta_P^{\beta^1}f_1$. The point of the estimate below is that we will replace β^1 in the twisted differences by b^1.

5.2. **Lemma.** *There holds*

$$\Big|\sum_{P\in\mathcal{G}^1}\ \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{G}^2\\ Q\cap 3P\neq\emptyset\,,\,2^{-r}\ell P\le\ell Q\le\ell P}} \langle T(\Delta_P^{\beta^1}f_1-\Delta_P^{b^1}f_1),\Delta_Q f_2\rangle\Big| \lesssim \{r\upsilon_1\mathbf{T}\}|Q^0|\,.$$

Proof. Perturbation inequality is the principal tool here. By introducing independent Rademacher variables $\{\epsilon_P\}_{P\in\mathcal{G}^1}$ that are jointly supported on a probability space $\Omega=\{-1,1\}^{\mathcal{G}^1}$, we have, for integers $0\le s\le r$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\sum_{P\in\mathcal{G}^1}\ &\sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{G}^2\\ Q\cap 3P\neq\emptyset\,,\,2^{-s}\ell P=\ell Q}} \langle T(\Delta_P^{\beta^1}f_1-\Delta_P^{b^1}f_1),\Delta_Q f_2\rangle\Big| \\
&=\Big|\int_\Omega\Big\langle\sum_{P\in\mathcal{G}^1}\epsilon_P T(\Delta_P^{\beta^1}f_1-\Delta_P^{b^1}f_1),\sum_{R\in\mathcal{G}^1}\epsilon_R\sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{G}^2\\ Q\cap 3R\neq\emptyset\,,\,2^{-s}\ell R=\ell Q}}\Delta_Q f_2\Big\rangle d\epsilon\Big| \\
&\lesssim\Big\{\int_\Omega\Big\|T\Big(\sum_{P\in\mathcal{G}^1}\epsilon_P\{\Delta_P^{\beta^1}-\Delta_P^{b^1}\}f_1\Big)\Big\|_{p_1}^{p_1}d\epsilon\Big\}^{1/p_1} \\
&\qquad\qquad\Big\{\int_\Omega\Big\|\sum_{P\in\mathcal{G}^1}\ \sum_{\substack{Q\in\mathcal{G}^2\\ Q\cap 3P\neq\emptyset\,,\,2^{-s}\ell P=\ell Q}}\epsilon_P\Delta_Q f_2\Big\|_{p_1'}^{p_1'}d\epsilon\Big\}^{1/p_1'}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Extract the operator norm from the first factor, and after that apply Khintchine's inequality and Theorem 3.15. Theorem 3.3 is used to estimate the second factor, but only after having changed the order of summation and having applied the Hölder's inequality and inequality $p_1'\le p_2$. Finally, summing the s-series yields the upper bound $r\upsilon_1\mathbf{T}|Q^0|$. □

Assume that $3P \cap Q \neq \emptyset$, and that $2^{-r}\ell P \leq \ell Q \leq \ell P$. We prove

$$\left|\langle T\Delta_P^{b^1} f_1, \Delta_Q f_2\rangle\right| \lesssim \{1 + \mathbf{T}_{\mathsf{loc}}\} \cdot \langle \Box_P^{b^1} f_1\rangle_P \langle \Box_Q f_2\rangle_Q |P| \,. \tag{5.3}$$

Note that we are using $\Box_P^{b^1} f_1$ on the right hand side. A straight forward appeal to (3.8) completes the proof of the diagonal estimate (5.1).

The cube P has 2^n children P'. If the child P' is not a stopping cube, $\Delta_P^{b^1} f_1 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{P'}$ is equal to a multiple of $b^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{P'}$, where S_1 is the $\mathcal{S}^1$ parent of P, and the multiple is given by the value of the half-twisted martingale difference $\widetilde{D}_P^{b^1} f_1$ on P'. If P' is also a stopping cube, then $\Delta_P^{b^1} f_1 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{P'}$ in addition involves a bounded multiple of $b^1_{P'}$. In any case, the constant multiples are bounded in absolute value by $\langle \Box_P^{b^1} f_1\rangle_P$, compare to definition (3.7). Similar comments apply to $\Delta_Q f_2 = \Delta_Q^{\beta^2} f_2$ restricted to a child Q'. By these considerations, it suffices to prove the estimate

$$|\langle T\psi^1, \psi^2\rangle| \lesssim \{1 + \mathbf{T}_{\mathsf{loc}}\}|P| \,,$$

where $\psi^1 = b^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{P'}$, and $\psi^2 \in \{\beta^2_{S_2}\mathbf{1}_{Q'}, \beta^2_{Q'}\mathbf{1}_{\{Q' \in \mathcal{S}^2\}}\}$, where S_2 is the $\mathcal{S}^2$ parent of Q. A similar estimate is also required when $\psi^1 = b^1_{P'}$, on the condition that $P' \in \mathcal{S}^1$. The obstruction to these estimates is that the stopping conditions control the local norm of $Tb^1_{S_1}$, but above, we have the restriction on $b^1_{S_1}$ *inside* the operator T.

The case of $\psi^1 = b^1_{P'}$, with $P' \in \mathcal{S}^1$, is especially easy, since the obstruction just mentioned does not arise. By construction of the stopping cubes, and the fact that Lebesgue measure is doubling,

$$|\langle Tb^1_{P'}, \psi^2\mathbf{1}_{P'}\rangle| \lesssim \|\mathbf{1}_{P'}Tb^1_{P'}\|_{p_2'}\|\psi^2\|_{p_2} \lesssim \mathbf{T}_{\mathsf{loc}}|P| \,.$$

Above, we have been careful to restrict the inner product to integration over P'. In the complementary case, inequality $p_1' \leq p_2$ and the Hardy inequality given in Lemma 3.17 implies

$$|\langle Tb^1_{P'}, \psi^2\mathbf{1}_{Q'\setminus P'}\rangle| \lesssim |P| \,.$$

In the case of $\psi^1 = b^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{P'}$ we must face the obstruction. Write

$$\psi^2 = \psi^2\mathbf{1}_{P'} + \psi^2\mathbf{1}_{Q'\setminus P'} \,.$$

The Hardy inequality controls the second term, giving

$$|\langle Tb^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{P'}, \psi^2\mathbf{1}_{Q'\setminus P'}\rangle| \lesssim |P| \,.$$

For the first term, return to the local Tb hypothesis, and write

$$\psi^2\mathbf{1}_{P'} = \langle\psi^2\rangle_{P'}b^2_{P'} + (\psi^2\mathbf{1}_{P'} - \langle\psi^2\rangle_{P'}b^2_{P'}) =: \langle\psi^2\rangle_{P'}b^2_{P'} + \widetilde{\psi}^2 \,.$$

The advantage of the first summand on the right is that the local Tb hypothesis gives us

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle \psi^2\rangle_{P'}\cdot\langle Tb^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{P'}, b^2_{P'}\rangle| &= |\langle\psi^2\rangle_{P'}\cdot\langle b^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{P'}, T^*b^2_{P'}\rangle| \\ &\lesssim \mathbf{T}_{\mathsf{loc}}|\langle\psi^2\rangle_{P'}|\cdot|P| \\ &\lesssim \mathbf{T}_{\mathsf{loc}}|P|\,.\end{aligned}$$

The advantage of the second summand is that it has integral zero: $\int_{P'}\widetilde{\psi}^2\,dx = 0$. Note that also $\|\widetilde{\psi}^2\|_{p_2}\lesssim |P|^{1/p_2}$. Take $\mathcal{P}$ to be the cubes of the form $P'\dotplus u$, where $u\in\{-1,0,1\}^n - 0$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle Tb^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{P'},\widetilde{\psi}^2\rangle| &\le |\langle Tb^1_{S_1},\widetilde{\psi}^2\rangle| + |\langle Tb^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{S_1\backslash P'},\widetilde{\psi}^2\rangle| \\ &\le |\langle Tb^1_{S_1},\widetilde{\psi}^2\rangle| + \sum_{R\in\mathcal{P}}|\langle Tb^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_R,\widetilde{\psi}^2\rangle| + |\langle Tb^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{S_1\backslash 3P'},\widetilde{\psi}^2\rangle|\,.\end{aligned}$$

The first term is controlled by the stopping rules:

$$|\langle Tb^1_{S_1},\widetilde{\psi}^2\rangle|\lesssim \mathbf{T}_{\mathsf{loc}}|P|\,.$$

The second sum is finite, and each summand is precisely of the type that appears in the Hardy Inequality. Indeed, although $R\in\mathcal{P}$ need not be contained in P, by (2.16) we nevertheless have

$$\langle|b^1_{S_1}|^{p_2'}\rangle_R^{1/p_2'}\le\langle|b^1_{S_1}|^{p_1}\rangle_R^{1/p_1}\le\{4^n\inf_{x\in P}M|b^1_{S_1}|^{p_1}\}^{1/p_1}\lesssim 1\,.$$

From this, it follows that

$$\sum_{R\in\mathcal{P}}|\langle Tb^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_R,\widetilde{\psi}^2\rangle|\lesssim\sum_{R\in\mathcal{P}}\|b^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_R\|_{p_2'}\cdot|P|^{1/p_2}\lesssim|P|\,.$$

By a similar estimate as in (the proof of) Lemma 5.7, and the stopping rules, it follows that

$$|\langle Tb^1_{S_1}\mathbf{1}_{S_1\backslash 3P'},\widetilde{\psi}^2\rangle|\lesssim\inf_{x\in P'}Mb^1_{S_1}\int|\widetilde{\psi}^2|\,dx\lesssim|P|\,.$$

This completes the proof of (5.3), and so the control of the diagonal term.

5.2. **The Nearby Term.** The nearby term concerns pairs of cubes $(P,Q)\in\mathcal{P}_{\mathsf{nearby}}$, that is, good cubes in $\mathcal{G}^1\times\mathcal{G}^2$ with the properties $2^r\ell Q<\ell P$ and $Q\subset 3P\backslash P$. This bilinear form can be written as a sum over $S\in\mathcal{S}^1$ of the terms

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{S\notin\mathcal{A}^1_*\}}\sum_{\substack{Q\,:\,Q\subset 3\pi S\backslash\pi S\\ 2^r\ell Q<\ell\pi S}}\langle f_1\rangle_S\cdot\langle T\beta^1_S,\Delta_Q f_2\rangle+\sum_{P:\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1}P=S}\ \sum_{\substack{Q:Q\subset 3P\backslash P\\ 2^r\ell Q<\ell P}}\langle T\widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1,\Delta_Q f_2\rangle\,. \tag{5.4}$$

The absolute value of the second term is estimated by a sum over integers $s > r$ of the following terms that are subject to condition $2^s \ell Q = \ell P$. By using Lemma 5.5 and then following the argument of (4.2), with obvious changes, we get an upper bound for a fixed $s > r$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{P : \pi_{\mathcal{S}^1} P = S} \sum_{\substack{Q : Q \subset 3P \setminus P \\ 2^s \ell Q = \ell P}} |\langle T \widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1, \Delta_Q f_2 \rangle| \\
&\lesssim 2^{-s\eta'} \sum_{P : \pi_{\mathcal{S}^1} P = S} \sum_{\substack{Q \,:\, Q \subset 3P \setminus P \\ 2^s \ell Q = \ell P}} \inf_{x \in Q} M\beta^1_S(x) \cdot \langle |\widetilde{D}_P f_1| \rangle_P \cdot \int_Q \square_Q f_2 \, dx \lesssim 2^{-s\eta'} |S| \,.
\end{aligned}$$

The right hand side is summable in s. The same method of proof controls the first term in (5.4); alternatively, one may apply the Hardy's inequality, Lemma 3.17. We omit the details.

We conclude our analysis of the nearby term by the basic Lemma that relies on goodness of Q.

5.5. **Lemma.** *Let* $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{nearby}}$ *with* $\pi_{\mathcal{S}^1} P = S$. *Then*

$$|\langle T \widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1, \Delta_Q f_2 \rangle| \lesssim \big(\ell Q / \ell P\big)^{\eta'} \cdot \inf_{x \in Q} M\beta^1_S(x) \cdot \langle |\widetilde{D}_P f_1| \rangle_P \cdot \int_Q \square_Q f_2 \, dx \,.$$

Here $\eta' = \eta(1 - \epsilon) > 0$.

Proof. By assumption, $Q \subset 3P \setminus P$ and $2^r \ell Q < \ell P$. Since Q is good, $|x - x_Q| \le |y - x_Q|/2$ for every $x \in Q$ and $y \in P$. Hence, the kernel smoothness condition applies, and we can estimate as follows with x_Q the center of Q.

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle T \widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1, \Delta_Q f_2 \rangle| &= \Big| \int_Q \int_P \{K(x, y) - K(x_Q, y)\} \widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1(y) \Delta_Q f_2(x) \, dy dx \Big| \\
&\lesssim \int_Q \int_P \frac{|x - x_Q|^\eta}{|x_Q - y|^{n+\eta}} \big| \widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1(y) \Delta_Q f_2(x) \big| \, dy dx \\
&\lesssim \big(\ell Q / \ell P\big)^{\eta(1-\epsilon)} \cdot \inf_{x \in Q} M \widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1(x) \cdot \int_Q |\Delta_Q f_2| \, dx \,.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $Q \in \mathcal{G}^2$,

$$\int_Q |\Delta_Q f_2| \, dx \lesssim \int_Q \square_Q f_2 dx \,.$$

Furthermore, by definition,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1| &= |\widetilde{D}_P f_1 \cdot \beta^1_S| \\
&= \sum_{P' \in \text{ch}(P)} |\langle \widetilde{D}_P f_1 \rangle_{P'}| \cdot |\beta^1_S \cdot \mathbf{1}_{P'}| \lesssim \langle |\widetilde{D}_P f_1| \rangle_P \cdot |\beta^1_S| \,.
\end{aligned}$$

In particular, $M\widetilde{\Delta}_P f_1 \lesssim \langle |\widetilde{D}_P f_1| \rangle_P \cdot M\beta^1_S$, so the desired estimate follows. □

5.3. **The Far Term.** The far term concerns pairs of cubes $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{far}}$, satisfying $\ell Q \leq \ell P$ and $3P \cap Q = \emptyset$. The goodness of these cubes is irrelevant here.

The far term is clearly bounded by the sum over integers $s \geq 0$ and $t \geq 1$ of

$$\sum_P \sum_{\substack{Q\,:\, 2^{t-1}\ell P \leq \text{dist}(P,Q) < 2^t \ell P \\ 2^s \ell Q = \ell P}} |\langle T\Delta_P f_1, \Delta_Q f_2 \rangle| \, . \tag{5.6}$$

Here, the summation is further restricted to pairs $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{far}}$. By Lemma 5.7, we obtain the following upper bound for the term (5.6).

$$\begin{aligned} &2^{-\eta s - (n+\eta)t} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} \sum_P \sum_{\substack{Q\,:\, 2^{t-1}\ell P \leq \text{dist}(P,Q) < 2^t \ell P \\ 2^s \ell Q = \ell P}} \langle \square_P f_1 \rangle_P \cdot \mathbf{1}_Q \cdot \square_Q f_2 \; dx \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\eta s - \eta t} \Big\| \Big[\sum_{P \in \mathcal{G}^1} |M \square_P f_1|^2 \Big]^{1/2} \Big\|_2 \Big\| \Big[\sum_{Q \in \mathcal{G}^2} |\square_Q f_2|^2 \Big]^{1/2} \Big\|_2 \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\eta(s+t)} |Q^0| \, . \end{aligned}$$

Observe that in the first estimate we lose a factor $2^{nt/2}$ twice, because of additional summation associated with both of the square functions. In order to see this for the first square function, one changes the order of summation and integration, and then applies inequality $|P|^{-1} \sum_Q |Q| \lesssim 2^{tn}$ for each P inside the P-summation.

The last bound above is still summable in s and t, so that we are left with proving the following basic Lemma.

5.7. **Lemma.** *Let* $(P, Q) \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{far}}$. *Then*

$$|\langle T\Delta_P f_1, \Delta_Q f_2 \rangle| \lesssim \big(\ell Q / \ell P\big)^{\eta} \cdot \left(\frac{\text{dist}(P, Q)}{\ell P} \right)^{-n-\eta} \cdot \langle \square_P f_1 \rangle_P \cdot \int_Q \square_Q f_2 \, .$$

Proof. Since $\text{dist}(P, Q) \geq \ell P$, the kernel smoothness condition applies with x_Q the center of Q.

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle T\Delta_P f_1, \Delta_Q f_2 \rangle| &= \Big| \int_Q \int_P \{K(x, y) - K(x_Q, y)\} \Delta_P f_1(y) \Delta_Q f_2(x) \; dy dx \Big| \\ &\lesssim \int_Q \int_P \frac{|x - x_Q|^\eta}{|x_Q - y|^{n+\eta}} \big| \Delta_P f_1(y) \Delta_Q f_2(x) \big| \; dy dx \\ &\lesssim \big(\ell Q\big)^\eta \cdot \text{dist}(P, Q)^{-\eta} \cdot \inf_{x \in Q} M\Delta_P f_1(x) \cdot \int_Q |\Delta_Q f_2| \; dx \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\int_P |\Delta_P f_1| \, dx \lesssim \int_P \Box_P f_1 \, dx, \qquad \int_Q |\Delta_Q f_2| \, dx \lesssim \int_Q \Box_Q f_2 dx \, .$$

Thus,

$$M\Delta_P f_1(x_Q) \lesssim \frac{1}{\operatorname{dist}(P,Q)^n} \int_{\mathbf{R}^n} |\Delta_P f_1| \, dx \lesssim \frac{|P|}{\operatorname{dist}(P,Q)^n} \langle \Box_P f_1 \rangle_P \, .$$

The desired estimate follows by combining the estimates above. □

References

[1] P. Auscher, S. Hofmann, C. Muscalu, T. Tao, and C. Thiele, *Carleson measures, trees, extrapolation, and* $T(b)$ *theorems*, Publ. Mat. **46** (2002), no. 2, 257–325.

[2] Pascal Auscher and Eddy Routin, *Local Tb theorems and Hardy inequalities*, J. Geometric Anal., to appear (2011), available at http://www.arxiv.org/abs/1011.1747.

[3] Pascal Auscher and Qi Xiang Yang, *BCR algorithm and the* $T(b)$ *theorem*, Publ. Mat. **53** (2009), no. 1, 179–196.

[4] G. Beylkin, R. Coifman, and V. Rokhlin, *Fast wavelet transforms and numerical algorithms. I*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **44** (1991), no. 2, 141–183.

[5] Donald L. Burkholder, *Explorations in martingale theory and its applications*, École d'Été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour XIX—1989, 1991, pp. 1–66.

[6] Michael Christ, *A* $T(b)$ *theorem with remarks on analytic capacity and the Cauchy integral*, Colloq. Math. **60/61** (1990), no. 2, 601–628.

[7] R. R. Coifman, Peter W. Jones, and Stephen Semmes, *Two elementary proofs of the* L^2 *boundedness of Cauchy integrals on Lipschitz curves*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **2** (1989), no. 3, 553–564, DOI 10.2307/1990943. MR986825 (90k:42017)

[8] Guy David and Jean-Lin Journé, *A boundedness criterion for generalized Calderón-Zygmund operators*, Ann. of Math. (2) **120** (1984), no. 2, 371–397.

[9] Tadeusz Figiel, *Singular integral operators: a martingale approach*, Geometry of Banach spaces (Strobl, 1989), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 158, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990, pp. 95–110. MR1110189 (94e:42015)

[10] Steve Hofmann, *A proof of the local* Tb *Theorem for standard Calderón-Zygmund operators* (2007), available at http://arxiv.org/abs/0705.0840.

[11] ______, *Local* $T(b)$ *theorems and applications in PDE*, Harmonic analysis and partial differential equations, Contemp. Math., vol. 505, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010, pp. 29–52. MR2664559 (2011e:42024)

[12] ______, *Local* Tb *theorems and applications in PDE*, International Congress of Mathematicians. Vol. II, Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006, pp. 1375–1392. MR2275650 (2007k:42030)

[13] Tuomas Hytönen, *The sharp weighted bound for general Calderon-Zygmund operators*, Ann. Math., to appear (2010), available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1007.4330.

[14] Tuomas Hytönen and Henri Martikainen, *Non-homogeneous Tb theorem and random dyadic cubes on metric measure spaces*, available at arxiv:0911.4387.

[15] ———, *On general local* Tb *theorems*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear), available at arxiv:1011.0642.

[16] Tuomas Hytönen and Fedor Nazarov, *The local* Tb *theorem with rough test functions* (2012).

[17] Michael T. Lacey, Eric T. Sawyer, Ignacio Uriarte-Tuero, and Chun-Yen Shen, *The Two Weight Inequality for Hilbert Transform, Coronas, and Energy Conditions*, available at http://www.arxiv.org/abs/1108.2319.

[18] ———, *Two Weight Inequality for the Hilbert Transform: A Real Variable Characterization*, available at http://www.arxiv.org/abs/1201.4319.

[19] Michael T. Lacey and Antti V. Vähäkangas, *The Perfect Local* Tb *Theorem and Twisted Martingale Transforms* (2012), available at http://www.arxiv.org/abs/1204.6526.

[20] F. Nazarov, S. Treil, and A. Volberg, *The* Tb*-theorem on non-homogeneous spaces*, Acta Math. **190** (2003), no. 2, 151–239.

[21] ———, *Accretive system* Tb*-theorems on nonhomogeneous spaces*, Duke Math. J. **113** (2002), no. 2, 259–312.

[22] ———, *Two weight estimate for the Hilbert transform and Corona decomposition for non-doubling measures* (2004), available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1003.1596.

[23] Stefanie Petermichl, *Dyadic shifts and a logarithmic estimate for Hankel operators with matrix symbol*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **330** (2000), no. 6, 455–460 (English, with English and French summaries). MR1756958 (2000m:42016)

[24] A. Volberg, *Calderón-Zygmund capacities and operators on nonhomogeneous spaces*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 100, Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 2003.

(M.T.L.) School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta GA 30332, USA

E-mail address: `lacey@math.gatech.edu`

(A.V.V.) Department of Mathematics and Statistics, P.O. Box 68, FI-00014 University of Helsinki, Finland

E-mail address: `antti.vahakangas@helsinki.fi`